

MAY 5 1947

VOLUME XLII

NUMBER 2

April 1947

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

A Quarterly Journal devoted to re-
search in the Languages, Literatures,
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

THE UNIVERSITY *of* CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITORS

JAKOB A. O. LARSEN, *Managing Editor*
JOHN PHILIP COOKE, *Assistant Editor*

CHARLES HENRY BEESON
BLANCHE BEATRICE BOYER
RICHARD TREAT BRÜERE

CARL DARLING BUCK
PHILLIP HOWARD DE LACY
BENEDICT EINARSON
FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON

RICHARD P. McKEON
RALPH MARCUS
GERTRUDE SMITH

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

HAROLD F. CHERNISS, *University of California*
KURT VON FRITZ, *Columbia University*
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*

Dom ANSELM STRITTMATTER, *St. Anselm's Priory*
LILY ROSS TAYLOR, *Bryn Mawr College*
JOSHUA WHATMOUGH, *Harvard University*

VOL. XLII

CONTENTS FOR APRIL 1947

No. 2

The Manuscripts of Bede	Charles H. Beeson	73
Notes on the Thracian <i>Phoros</i>	Charles Edson	88
Homer's Descriptions of Syncope	Alfons Nehring	106
Notes and Discussions		122
PEARL CLEVELAND WILSON: Note on <i>Eumenides</i> 881-91.—WILLIAM HARDY ALEXANDER: <i>Juvenal</i> 7. 126-28.—L. A. POST: Emendation of <i>Pindar Olympian</i> 9. 82 (76).		
Book Reviews		125
JOHANNES CORNELIS OPSTELTEN: <i>Sophocles en het griekse Pessimisme</i> (Linforth).— <i>Phyllobolia für Peter von der Mühl zum 60. Geburtstag</i> (Krappe).—HAROLD S. WILSON and CLARENCE A. FORBES (eds. and trans.): <i>Gabriel Harcey's "Ciceronianus"</i> (Caplan).—DAVIS P. HARDING: <i>Milton and the Renaissance Ovid</i> (Bush).—PAULA PHILIPPSON: <i>Thessalische Mythologie</i> (Johnson).—REINHOLD STRÖMBERG: <i>Griechische Wortstudien und Studien zur Etymologie und Bildung der griechischen Fischnamen</i> (Whatmough).—P. CHANTRAINE: <i>Morphologie historique du grec</i> (Whatmough).		
Books Received		135
Medieval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries		136

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. ¶The subscription price is \$4.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.25. Orders for service of less than a full year will be charged at the single-copy rate. ¶Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States and its possessions, Argentina, Bolivia, Brasil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Republic of Honduras, Mexico, Morocco (Spanish Zone), Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Rio de Oro, El Salvador, Spain (including Balearic Islands, Canary Islands, and the Spanish Offices in Northern Africa; Andorra), Spanish Guinea, Uruguay, and Venezuela. ¶Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada and Newfoundland, 16 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.16), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.29); for all other countries in the Postal Union 40 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.40), on single copies, 10 cents (total \$1.35). ¶Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in United States currency or its equivalent by postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized agents:

For the British Empire, except North America, India, and Australasia: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London, N.W. 1, England. Prices of yearly subscriptions and of single copies may be had on application.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 37, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor of *Classical Philology*, Box M, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill. All manuscripts must be typed, double spaced—both texts and notes—with ample margins on firm paper (not onion-skin, etc.).

The articles in this journal are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York, N.Y.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

Entered as second-class matter June 20, 1906, at the post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in United States Postal Act of October 3, 1917, Section 1103, amended February 28, 1925, authorized June 6, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

the
the
m
su
in
m
d
ce
w
th
or
la
of
ti
w
th
ni
wh
re
la
of
th
sc
th
tra

ed.

H.
(Co

[CLA

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XLII

APRIL 1947

Number 2

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF BEDE

CHARLES H. BEESON

SOME years ago Professor Laistner, our leading Bede scholar, formed the plan of making a detailed study of the manuscripts of Bede written before the year 950, somewhat along the lines of my own book on Isidore.¹ The war made such a study impossible, and he published, instead, a summary list of the surviving manuscripts, numbering more than 1,500, dating from the eighth to the sixteenth century.² The place of origin is stated wherever it is possible. No better author than Bede could be chosen to throw light on the cultural movements in the various lands of western Europe and the activity of their scriptoria from his period to the time of the Renaissance, whereas Isidore was the ideal author for the period from the seventh century to the middle of the ninth. Both offer a variety of texts, from which one might judge the interest of readers at various times and in various lands. Both, too, offer a clear-cut picture of the diaspora of the manuscripts from the start. We have in each case manuscripts not far removed from the times of the author, and for each the stream of the tradition begins in outlying lands of the

Empire and, in consequence, is the more easily followed.

In addition to the list of the manuscripts, Laistner gives a valuable inventory of the nontheological works of Bede found in medieval catalogues which supplements that published by Manitius,³ and another of the theological works from 109 medieval collections, containing more than 500 works of Bede.

An examination of this material reveals facts that were known in a general way to students of Bede and to paleographers. For example, it was obvious that there were, almost from the beginning, more old manuscripts of Bede on the Continent than in England, but few realized how one-sided the score is. Here the parallel with Isidore continues. There are almost no old manuscripts of Isidore in Spain; yet this land furnished Isidore manuscripts to Italy and France, and probably England, while the author was still living. The export of Isidore texts soon stopped because, with the inroads of the Moslems, production stopped. Similarly in England the repeated attacks of the Vikings in the ninth century not only hampered the production of new manuscripts but destroyed many of those previously produced.

¹ *Isidor-Studien* ("Quellen und Untersuchungen," ed. Traube, Vol. IV, No. 2 [Munich, 1913]).

² M. L. W. Laistner, with the collaboration of H. H. King, *A Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts* (Cornell University Press, 1943).

³ *Handschriften antiker Autoren in mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskatalogen* (Leipzig, 1933), pp. 344-54.

Fortunately, large numbers of manuscripts had been carried or sent to the Continent by Anglo-Saxon monks, and naturally Bede, their greatest writer, was included. From letters of Boniface and Lull it is known that Fulda and Mainz possessed copies, and there were doubtless others at an early date at Corbie, Echternach, Würzburg, Reichenau, and Lorsch. It was these Anglo-Saxon centers that were mainly responsible for the spread of Bede texts on the Continent.

At first, the monks who came to the Continental centers employed their national script, but in the course of the ninth century they changed to the Caroline minuscule. We find many examples of the process in operation: the scribes write Continental script with what might be called an "Anglo-Saxon accent"; the writing habits of a lifetime are not easily abandoned. Very often the old and the new scripts appear side by side in the same manuscript, sometimes on the same page and by the same hand; for example, in MS Kassel Astron. F. 2, the second column of folio 28v appears to have been written by an Anglo-Saxon scribe using Continental minuscule, the first column and 19½ lines of the second on folio 29r by the same hand using his national script; similarly, on folio 59r, column 1 and lines 1-22 of column 2 are in Continental script, and lines 23-40 are Anglo-Saxon, which thereafter continues to the end of the manuscript (fol. 84v).

Of course, other than Insular centers were active also, especially in France, and undoubtedly they made good in part to the English the diminished output of their monasteries. It is generally impossible to determine when a Continental manuscript came to England, but occasionally Anglo-Saxon glosses or marginalia fix the date at least approximately. For example, the Oxford manuscript, Bodl.

218, containing Bede on Luke, was written at Tours in the first half of the ninth century and, according to Rand,⁴ English scribes made additions and corrections in the ninth-tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries; the British Museum codex of Bede's *De temporum ratione* (Cotton Vesp. B. VI), written in France about the middle of the ninth century, contains Anglo-Saxon glosses of the early eleventh century.⁵

Lowe's report of manuscripts in the libraries of Great Britain,⁶ limited to manuscripts which antedate the ninth century, contains only four Bede items, all Anglo-Saxon—two manuscripts of the *Historia ecclesiastica* and two of commentaries on the Bible. They are, respectively, (1) the Cambridge codex (Kk. V. 16), the oldest Bede manuscript that has survived, perhaps written on the Continent about 737, i.e., within two years after Bede's death; (2) a Cotton manuscript in the British Museum (Tib. C. II); (3) a single folio (incomplete) in the Wilfred Merton collection (42) in London containing Bede's Commentary on Luke; and (4) an Oxford manuscript of the Commentary on Proverbs (Bodl. 819), which Lowe dates *sæc.* VIII-IX.

Of Bede's theological texts there are preserved about 200 manuscripts written prior to the eleventh century, including a half-dozen codices which may belong to the end of the eighth. Some 15 of these are found in English libraries, but at least 5 of them came to England from the Continent, as the script shows.⁷ For the

⁴ *A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours*, I (Mediaeval Academy of America, 1929), 129.

⁵ Charles W. Jones, *Beda Opera de temporibus* (Mediaeval Academy of America, 1943), p. 126.

⁶ *Codices Latini antiquiores*, Part II (Oxford, 1935).

⁷ Laistner gives a table showing the distribution of the various Commentaries in manuscripts copied before the year 900 in Continental centers. Those represented by more than 5 manuscripts are (in order) Corbie, St. Gall, Reichenau, Fleury, and St. Emmeram.

period after the tenth century, English manuscripts comprise about 200 theological items and Continental copies three times that number.

In his edition of the two Commentaries on the Acts of the Apostles, Laistner⁸ depended for the *Expositio* on 15 copies out of a total of 67 listed and for the *Retractatio* on 7 manuscripts out of a list of 23. All belong to the eighth or ninth century, and none is English in origin.

Not a single one of the 21 manuscripts of Bede's *Martyrology* is English.

Bede's three scientific treatises tell the same story. Jones,⁹ in his edition of *De temporum ratione*, used 18 manuscripts selected out of a list of 133. Libraries on the Continent furnish 14, all *saec.* IX, and British libraries the other 4, only 2 of which were written in England—a twelfth-century Glasgow manuscript from Durham and a Salisbury codex written in the second half of the ninth century. The remaining two are British Museum codices of the ninth century, written on the Continent. For the second treatise, *De temporibus liber*, Jones¹⁰ used 10 manuscripts out of a list of 57; 8 are Continental, all of the ninth century, and 2 are English, both *saec.* XII. The third scientific work, *De natura rerum*, is found in 125 manuscripts. The ratio of ninth-century manuscripts is high, nearly 40; the tenth-century manuscripts are about half as many. A fragment (2 fols.) of an Oxford manuscript is the only ninth-century English copy listed¹¹—a ninth century British Museum codex is French in origin. Of the later manuscripts, the

English number less than one-fourth of the total.

Bede wrote three school treatises—*De arte metrica*, *De schematibus et tropis*, and *De orthographia*. Of the first two, not a single English manuscript as old as the tenth century survives. One English manuscript of the third can be definitely assigned to the ninth century. There are 36 Continental manuscripts of the three texts, divided about equally between the ninth and the tenth centuries.

England makes a better showing in the *Historia ecclesiastica*. The total number of English manuscripts (70) is almost equal to that on the Continent. The older manuscripts are English. The oldest of them all, however, the Moore Bede (Cambridge Kk. V. 16, a. 737), and the Leningrad codex, probably the next oldest (Q. I. 18, a. 746), may have been written on the Continent. But a London Cotton codex (Tib. C. II) was written in England in the eighth century, and a second (Tib. A. XIV), in the early ninth. Against them the Continent is represented by 2 eighth-century manuscripts and 9 of the ninth. The peak was reached in the twelfth century: 27 Continental and 22 English.

Bede reached Italy relatively late. Only some two dozen manuscripts older than the tenth century are found in Italian libraries, and about half of these originated north of the Alps. The peak was reached in the eleventh century, a century earlier than in the rest of Europe, owing largely to the fact that this was the golden era of Monte Cassino. In Italy the center of the diaspora was, as we should expect, Bobbio. The situation, as revealed by an examination of the tenth-century catalogue of the Bobbio library,¹² is illuminating. Bede's works are not found

⁸ Bedae Venerabilis Expositio Actuum Apostolorum et Retractatio (Mediaeval Academy of America, 1939).

⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 173–291.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 293–303.

¹¹ Digby 63, fols. 33v–34v, selections from *De natura rerum*. But immediately preceding (fols. 30v–33r) is chap. 1, "De loquela digitorum," from *De temporum ratione* (not noted by Jones or Laistner).

¹² Becker, *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui* (1883), No. 32.

in the main *fonds* of the library, but his name does appear among the books presented by various donors. Benedict the presbyter gave a copy of his work on metric (No. 523), and another work, of which the title is not given (No. 526); the presbyter Theodore gave a *martyrologium* and two items not defined (Nos. 579, 580, and 585); a brother Smaragdus, possibly an Irishman, the tract on metric (No. 656); the presbyter Peter, the rare work *In titulis Psalmorum* (No. 613). The largest gift was that of the first donor, "Dungalus praecipuus Scottorum." He contributed 40 items, among them 4 theological works of Bede and possibly a fifth (the text of the catalogue is corrupt at this point).

The oldest Italian Bede manuscript was written at Monte Cassino, the Codex Parisinus 7530, one of the most interesting from a paleographical and philological point of view that the Middle Ages produced. It is the most comprehensive of our early miscellaneous collections, containing texts dealing with grammar, rhetoric, orthography, astronomy, metrolgy, the computus, glosses, abbreviations, critical notes, etc.¹³ The presence of a German gloss *forbotan* (over *interdictum*) and of Insular abbreviations in Bede's *Orthography* suggested to Lindsay¹⁴ a German (Fulda?) original. But the Insular abbreviations are not confined to Bede. The archetype of the entire collection was probably a Fulda codex. In a text from Isidore the Parisinus has a wrong reading that is reported from only one other manuscript of Isidore, a Basle manuscript that came from Fulda. On the basis of a Monte Cassino calendar contained in it, Lowe dates the Parisinus 779-97, but these limits can be narrowed with some

probability. One of the treatises is a compilation on the parts of speech, based on Charisius, Diomedes, and Priscian. Of these, Diomedes falls within the Fulda sphere of influence, since all our manuscripts of Diomedes are descended from a copy made by Adam of Worms for Charlemagne in the year 780. The readings of the Parisinus show that its text of Diomedes belongs to the Adam tradition. How did the archetype of the Parisinus get to Monte Cassino? Lowe¹⁵ made the plausible suggestion that it came through Sturm, the first abbot of Fulda, who was sent by Boniface on a mission to Monte Cassino, but the date *ante quem non* is fixed by Adam's Diomedes. A possibility is that Paulus Diaconus is the intermediary. Paulus went to the court of Charlemagne in the year 782, two years after the arrival there of the Diomedes manuscript. In the Parisinus, in the midst of excerpts from Diomedes are two rhythmical poems based on Diomedes (fols. 7v-8). Neff¹⁶ suggests that the first is by Petrus of Pisa, Charlemagne's teacher of grammar; the author of the second is indicated by the acrostic *Paulus feci*. The subject matter is a continuation of the first poem. If Paulus carried the Fulda codex or a copy of it to Monte Cassino, that would fix the date for the Parisinus after 786, probably not long after he returned to Italy.

My tests discover surprisingly few omissions in Laistner's lists. It is safe to say that no manuscript vital for the constitution of the text has been overlooked. The future editor of Bede will be spared the vast amount of drudgery incidental to the preliminary work of a search for manuscripts.

Laistner's original plan of making a de-

¹³ See Eckstein, *Anecdota Parisina rhetorica*, Programm (Halle, 1852); and Kell, *Grammatici Latini*, IV (Leipzig, 1864), xlii n.

¹⁴ *Notae Latinae* (Cambridge, 1915), p. xv.

¹⁵ *Scriptura Beneventana* (Oxford, 1929), Pl. IX.

¹⁶ *Die Gedichte des Paulus Diaconus* ("Quellen und Untersuchungen," ed. Traube, Vol. III, No. 4 [Munich, 1908]), p. 75.

tailed study of the old manuscripts still remains an *opus desideratum*. Let us hope that the investigations which he has already conducted will make possible the speedy completion of his task and that we may have from his pen, along with a study of the influence of England and of Bede on the Continent, a sketch of the "Insular islands"—for which Bede manuscripts offer unsurpassed material.

I add some comments on a few of the more interesting manuscripts on which I happen to have notes. Some of these manuscripts reflect the interplay of Continental and Anglo-Saxon (and Irish) forces and, incidentally, throw a sidelight on the making of schoolbooks, their wear and tear, and their repair.

Bern 207 is a good example of an Irish grammatical corpus. Lindsay, who first discussed the manuscript at some length,¹⁷ suggested on the basis of its ornamentation—unusual in such a codex—that it was "the compiler's own copy, written under his direction by two skilled penmen" and that it served as "a text-book for his lectures." The manuscript once belonged to Fleury; on the lower margin of folio 138v stands an entry of later date than the text, *hic est liber sancti Benedicti Floriacensis*, and on folios 127v (from the middle of the page)—129rv (continued on fol. 195rv, according to Hagen¹⁸) a later addition in Fleury minuscule. But whether the collection was made and transcribed at Fleury remained for Lindsay a matter of conjecture only, in view of the script in which it is written, a peculiar Irish type of which no other specimen has been reported.

The codex is listed by Laistner among the manuscripts containing *De temporum ratione* and is dated *sac.* VIII. A refer-

ence to Jones's list¹⁹ discloses that we have to do only with "De loquela digitorum," the opening chapter of the work, defective at the beginning and possibly at the end. This chapter is often preserved separately in the manuscripts, and Jones raises the question whether the Bern manuscript marks its first appearance separately. That can be answered in the negative; Paris 7530, to which Jones refers as a possible alternative, is at least a century older. Why he dates the Bern codex *sac.* VIII is not clear, unless the date 792, which occurs in a paschal cycle with a red smudge in the margin opposite, is regarded as significant. Scribes in copying such documents often marked the current year with a red dot. But the presence of such a mark is unreliable as evidence—it may have been copied with the table or it may be accidental. In this instance Lindsay²⁰ suggests that the red smudge is an impress from the paint on the next page—color (red, green, brown) is freely used by way of ornament in this manuscript. In any case the script, which is of a unique Insular type, cannot possibly be so early as the eighth century. It probably belongs at the end of the ninth. This same manuscript appears also among the manuscripts listed as containing *De schematibus et tropis*, but under the signature "Paris 7520, s. X-XI." The Paris catalogue is quite misleading on this item. It states that the codex is written partly in the tenth and partly in the eleventh century. In actual fact it is made up of fragments of at least eight manuscripts belonging to the ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries. The first of these, composed of folios 1-24, it has been proved conclusively,²¹ belongs to Bern 207 and once

¹⁷ *Early Irish Minuscule Script* (Oxford, 1910), pp. 64-67; *Palaeographia Latina*, Part II (Oxford, 1923), pp. 61-65.

¹⁸ *Anecdota Helvetica, Grammatici Latini supplementum* (Leipzig, 1870), p. xxix.

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 149.

²⁰ *Palaeographia Latina*, Part II, p. 64.

²¹ Blanche B. Boyer, "A Paris Fragment of Codex Bern 207," *Classical Philology*, XXXII (1937), 113-20, with two facsimiles.

formed an actual part of it (fols. 212-35). The Bede text stands on folios 23-24v but consists of only *De schematibus*, though the heading (fol. 23r. 9) reads *De schematibus et tropis*.

Paris 4841 is cited for the "Versus Bedae" (p. 129) and *De arte metrica* (p. 135). The date (saec. X) is apparently taken from Manitius.²² The codex consists of portions of 3 or 4 manuscripts. Part I was written in the ninth century. It comprises the remains of 2 manuscripts (fols. 1-31v, 32-69v). The first half consists of four quaternions with letters as quaternion signatures, 22-23 lines to the page. The texts are: *De situ orbis*, compiled from Isidore and Orosius; excerpts from Isidore's *De notis* (*Etym.* i. 21. 2-23); and the *Notae Papianae*, which breaks off at the end of a quaternion (fol. 31v). The leaves of the second half were originally larger than those of the first. The quire marks, if present formerly, were cut off in rebinding; the number of lines to the page varies from 24 to 26. The two halves are certainly contemporary and were written in the same scriptorium; they have the same Spanish paleographical peculiarities. After the two were combined, Roman numerals were substituted for letters as signatures, and the enumeration was continued through the second half (fol. 63v = VIII). The texts of the second are: a collection of *Sinonima*, attributed by the corrector to Isidore; two collections of *Differentiae* (one containing excerpts from Isidore *Differentiae* Book ii). This part of the codex preserves the Spanish symptoms expected in an Isidore text (*aū* = *autem*, *iðs* = *id est*, *n̄r* = *noster*; Spanish *g* occurs); these are crossed with Insular symptoms (*fr̄ar* = *frater*, *fr̄as* = *fratres*, *iūx* = *iuxta*;²³ there are many

²² *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, I (1911), 74.

²³ Lindsay (*Notae Latinae*, p. 116) reports *iūx* for *iuxta* from three manuscripts—the Anglo-Saxon

cases of Insular spelling). Unique are the abbreviations for *hoc est*; *hoē* occurs several times; it probably originated (by error) from *hoē*, which occurs two or three times; even *hoš* occurs (all three forms on fol. 51v). Folios 70-91 form a separate manuscript, written toward the end of the ninth century. It contains Bede *De metrica ratione* and the metric of Mallius Theodorus (incomplete). The last portion (fols. 92-106v), written perhaps a little later, contains the beginning of the *Orthography* of Bede (fol. 92); apparently only one page was ever written: folios 92v and 93, originally left blank, contain poems which were added later. The *Orthography* of Alcuin (incomplete) follows. The *Versus Bedae in Apocalypsin* and the *Oratio* of Prudentius (*Hamartig.* 931 ff.) are found on folio 99; and grammatical material on folios 100-106v.²⁴ The codex shows Anglo-Saxon influence throughout.

Paris 14088 figures three times in Laistner's lists: (p. 142) *De natura rerum*; (p. 146) *De temporibus*; (p. 150) *De temporum ratione*. It should appear also among the manuscripts containing both *De arte metrica* and *De schematibus et tropis* (pp. 132-34). The part in question (fols. 2-98) is a miscellany written by four or five different hands in ninth-century script.²⁵ The folios are bound in disorder and numbered in sequence as bound, but old quaternion signatures scattered throughout make it possible to reconstruct plausibly the original order of

Moore Bede (*passim*); a Bobbio Commentary on the Psalms (Milan, C 301 inf., more than once) in Irish minuscule, saec. VIII-IX; and Ivrea 42, saec. IX, with Insular abbreviations: *fr̄as* for *fratres* is confined almost exclusively to Insular manuscripts; *fr̄ar* for *frater* does not seem to be reported from any codex.

²⁴ On the poems found in the manuscript see *Neues Archiv d. Ges. f. dt. deutsche Geschichtskunde*, IV (1871), 149, 150.

²⁵ This description I owe to Professor Boyer, whose notes on the manuscript are more detailed than mine.

the extant portions (estimated to be approximately one-half the whole). These numerals are as follows: XVII, folio 33v; XVIII, folio 41v; XVIII, folio 49v; XX, folio 22v; XXIII, folio 9v; XXV, folio 25v (and perhaps VII, fol. 69v; II, fol. 92v). The contents divide into four main sections of unequal extent.

The first block of continuous text was presumably from Isidore, *Etym.*, of which Book viii. 5. 17-9. 19 and 11. 35-104 appear in quaternions II and III on folios 86-97v. 20.

The second, an unidentified theological fragment treating questions numbered xviii-ci, occupies gatherings VII and VIII, a quaternion and a quinion, respectively (fols. 62-79).

The third section, Donatus, *Ars grammatica* (*Minor* and *Maior*), begins in quaternion XVII and ends on the first folio of XX (fols. 29v. 8-49v and 15r. 1-22). Preceding it in quaternion XVII are verses from Isaiah (fol. 26), hymns attributed to St. Ambrose (fols. 26-28v), and an extract from a sermon concluding with a quotation from Proverbs (fol. 29r. 1-7).

The fourth and largest portion comprises the following works of Bede:

1. *De schematibus et tropis*, in quaternion XX (fols. 15r. 25-21r. 2), followed by an anonymous *Confessio fidei* (fols. 21r. 4-22v and 80r-81v), composed of articles i-xv, xxii-li.
2. *De natura rerum*, quaternion XXII entire (fols. 50-57) and two extra folios (58, 59), the second of which contains also:
3. *De temporibus*, capp. i-v (fol. 59rv). Further chapters, overlooked by Jones,²⁶ are found on folios 82-84v in wrong sequence (capp. xiv, xi, xii, xiii), and also at least the last three chapters of the *Chronica minora*, numbered xx, xxi, and xxii.
4. *De arte metrica*, quaternion XXIV entire (fols. 2-9) and slightly more than half of

XXV (fols. 10-14v. 18). In the latter, folios 13-14 are the inner double leaf; inserted after folio 14 stands quaternion XX (fols. 15-22), and, in consequence, the remaining folios of XXV bear the numbers 23, 24, 25.

5. *De temporum ratione*, of which Jones²⁷ identified as capp. xv, xvi, the contents of folios 23r-25v; but he noted no discrepancies in the text of these or any connection between them and folio 14v. 19-28 or folios 60-61. The upper half of folio 61r contains a part of DTR cap. viii (*de hebdomada*), beginning *perpetuo circa solem currendo quasi*, which is paralleled in DRC cap. v (Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, XC, 583C-584A), and ending with the definition found only in the latter, *Feria a fando . . . per singulos dies*, said by Jones not to be from Bede. On the lower half is an extract from DTR cap. xi, "de mense," beginning *Menses dicti a mensura* (= DRC cap. vi; *ibid.*, 584C-585A). This ends on folio 61v and, in turn, is followed by a section from DTR cap. xii (*de mensibus Romanorum*), *cum ingenio acri . . . Idus Quintiles Iulius*, continued without a break on folio 60v, *procreatus . . .*, and concluded on 60v (= DRC cap. vii; *ibid.*, 585A-D). Next are nine lines from DTR cap. xl, "de bisexto," *ob hoc autem diem . . . interponebant diem* (with an omission = DRC cap. vii; *ibid.*, 587A); then DTR cap. xiii, "de Kalendis," *Priscis temporibus . . . et ipsi curiae*, the final words of folio 60v (= DRC cap. viii; *ibid.*, 587B). This text is continued without a break on folio 14v. 19-28, *ad quam vocabantur Calabriae . . . idus dictas vocabulo* and on folio 24r. 1-8, *Graeco . . . perveniunt*, the last word of the second sentence of cap. xiv (*de mensibus Graecorum*), to which is added in lines 8-11 the conclusion of DRC cap. viii (*ibid.*, 587D-588A): *quorum Aegypti quarto Kalendas Septembris, Graeci autem a Kalendis Decembris suum inchoant annum: Kalendas vocationes Nonae*

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 155. In the following, the abbreviations "DTR" and "DRC" (for *De temporum ratione* and *De ratione computi*, respectively) are adopted from his *Pseudepigrapha* (see below). His edition of DTR is the basis for the collation of cap. xv.

²⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 166.

observatio, Idus divisio (omitting the final word *interpretatur*).

A comparison of these details with the analysis of DRC given by Jones²³ would seem to indicate that we have here not the text of DTR but that of the shorter tract, DRC. It is not, however, identical with the latter: (1) in these folios there is no indication of the questions and answers which form the framework of the latter; (2) in several instances of variation in reading between the two, these folios preserve the reading of DTR, e.g., folio 61v, *nomen* and *Iulius* DTR *om.* DRC; 60v, *enim* and *post* DTR *autem* and *per* DRC; 14v, *minor* DTR *omnis* DRC; 24r, *quae* DTR *quia* DRC; *Notandum autem quod* DTR, *om.* DRC; *nihil aliud quam ortum lunae intelligere debemus* DTR *nihil aliud intelligendum est quam ortum novum lunae* DRC; *autem* DTR *hic* DRC; *neominias id est* DTR *om.* DRC. Possibly this represents a selection from, and a rearrangement of, chapters of DTR, with additions (which survive elsewhere only in DRC) preparatory to recasting in the dialogue form of DRC.

Chapter xv of DTR (not used in DRC), "de anglorum mensibus," begins with the words *Anglorum populi* in line 11 of folio 23r and ends with *donasti* in line 17 of folio 23v. Here are omitted the initial words, *Antiqui autem*, and the parentheses of the first sentence—(*neque enim mihi congruum videtur aliarum gentium annalem observantiam dicere et meae reticere*). Among its variants are: *observare* for *computavere* (Jones, l. 4); *unde qui* for *unde* (l. 4); *eusturmonath* for *eosturmonath* (l. 8); *modraneth* for *modranect* (l. 13); *id est* for *hoc est* (l. 16); and many an instance of the Anglo-Saxon letter eth (ð), which Jones reports from the twelfth-century

Glasgow manuscript, e.g., *solmonað* (l. 7), *ðrimielci* (l. 8), *liða* (l. 8), *ueoðmonað* (l. 9), *haligmonað* (l. 9), *uintir filliða* (l. 9), *blotnoða* (l. 10). On the remainder of folio 23v and on folio 24r appear two excerpts from DTR *cap.* xxxv, "de temporibus" (= DRC *cap.* ix: *Patr. Lat.*, 588A-C) accompanied by a paraphrase of the ps.-Anatolian quotation which occurs only in DTR, and on folio 24rv selections from DTR *cap.* xxxvi, "de anno" (= DRC *cap.* xi: *ibid.*, 589B-590A); on folios 24v-25v, "de circulo zodiaco" (= DRC *cap.* xii: *ibid.*, 590B-D, lacking the last two sentences), based on DTR *cap.* xvi, and short extracts, viz. (*de bissexta*) from DTR *cap.* xxxviii (= DRC *cap.* xiii: *ibid.*, 591A-D), (*de mensura cimenti*) from DTR *cap.* xlii (= DRC *cap.* xiv: *ibid.*, 592A), (*de saltu lunae*) from DTR *cap.* xlii (= DRC *cap.* xv: *ibid.*, 592B-D).

This entire fifth item from Bede is written in a hand conspicuously different from all the rest, a script closely resembling, but not identical with, that of the *codex mutilus* Bern 207+Paris 7520. It is a second specimen of this peculiar script, the calligraphic product of a scribe no less expert than the two (or three?²⁴) who wrote the Bern corpus. Its presence in this Paris manuscript (Sangermanensis 1464, *olim* 291) is entirely consonant with the theory of a Fleury origin; some of the non-Insular pages (among them fol. 2, which contains the *capitula* and beginning of Bede's *De arte metrica*) are written in a somewhat finer minuscule, which shows a likeness to that of the ninth-century Floriacenses, Bern 433 (*Rhet. ad Herennium*) and Bern 351 (Quintilian). Thus Lindsay's hypothesis regarding Bern 207 is strengthened by the coincidence that Paris 14088 displays another instance of the unusual type of Irish script first met in the former and that the works of three

²³ *Bedaes Pseudepigrapha: Scientific Writings Falsely Attributed to Bede* (Cornell University Press, 1939), pp. 40-41.

²⁴ Boyer, *op. cit.*, p. 113, n. 4.

authors—Donatus, Isidore, and Bede—are common to both; of Bede, the chapter "De loquela digitorum" from *De temporum ratione* on folio II (*olim* 264) of Bern 207; *De schematibus* on folios 23–24 of Paris 7520 (*olim* fols. 234–35 of Bern 207); *De schematibus et tropis*, *De natura rerum*, *De temporibus*, *De arte metrica*, and *De temporum ratione* in Paris 14088 as given above.

The description of Paris 16668 (p. 134) quoted from Lindsay,³⁰ stating that folios 1–40 are in Continental minuscule, while folios 41–58 are in Anglo-Saxon minuscule, gives a wrong impression of the codex. Part I has a thoroughly Insular background. In Bede's *De arte metrica* the headings and the first line of the text are written in round Insular letters, and the letters of the headings are picked out with color (red, yellow, blue, etc.). The initial letters are often surrounded by dots after the Insular fashion. The Preface of Aldhelm's *De virginitate* (fol. 23) is written in round Insular half-uncials, with variegated color schemes. Paragraphs in the poem are indicated by lines in round Insular with enlarged initials (where other manuscripts employ titles, e.g., "De sancto Gregorio" at vs. 710). The "Themistius" of Part II is in reality Cassiodorus.

Sessorianus 11, in the library Vittorio Emmanuele in Rome, was queried by Lindsay³¹ "Beneventan(?) minuscule." Laistner (p. 54), on the authority of Lowe, states that the manuscript has no connection with Monte Cassino and that certain peculiarities in its script suggest an Anglo-Saxon exemplar. I noted the rare Insular abbreviation *mī* for *mihi* (fol. 5), which Lindsay reports from only 2 manuscripts (both *saec.* IX)—Paris 13029 with Breton glosses and Montpellier 55 (both have

Insular abbreviations: *-r̄* = *-rum* [Insular] and *-runt* [Continental]). Insular influence in the Sessorianus is crossed with Spanish; *ām* for *autem* occurs once (fol. 10). The form *p̄p̄r* for *propter*, which occurs once (fol. 7), is not reported from any source except a doubtful case by Lindsay. It may be a development from *p̄p̄r*, which is found occasionally in Insular and Spanish manuscripts.

Of the centers that had Anglo-Saxon connections the only important one which was not fully exploited by Laistner was Würzburg. The catalogue of this library, "Als Manuscript gedruckt" (1886), contains 11 items under Bede. These include the three manuscripts known to Laistner: Theol. fol. 46, 49, 118; and a fourth listed "press-mark not known," which is th. f. 74, *De locis sanctis*.—*Relatio abbreviata*, *saec.* IX. The others are: *Expositio in lb. Tobiae*, th. f. 128, *saec.* XII; *Martyrologium*, th. f. 50, *saec.* IX; *De tabernaculo*, th. f. 59, *saec.* IX–X; *Homilia in evangelium lb. generationis*, th. f. 44, *saec.* XI; *Expositio super parabolas Salomonis*, th. f. 40, *saec.* XIII; and *De remediis peccatorum*, j. q. 2, *saec.* XIV.

The codex th. f. 59 consists of 2 manuscripts; it contains in the first quaternion fragments of two homilies on the Gospels (37, 38) by Gregory the Great. The script is Anglo-Saxon, *saec.* IX. The remainder of the manuscript (fols. 9–100), in Continental script, said to be *saec.* IX, contains *De tabernaculo*, beginning with chapter 3 of Book i. The text shows Insular abbreviations: *lr* (*autem*), *ꝛ* (*con*), *ꝛꝛ* (*contra*), and the reversed *e* symbol for *eius*.

Mention should be made of two other manuscripts, in whose Table of Contents as printed in the catalogues the name of Bede does not appear. Oxford, Bodl. Canon. 279, written in a beautiful French hand of the tenth century, perhaps at

³⁰ *Palaeographia Latina*, Part III (1924), p. 33.

³¹ *Notae Latinae*, p. 483.

Corbie, contains the *Orthography* of Cassiodorus, folios 35–42v (defective; beginning *non semper*, etc., Keil, *GL*, VII, 153. 11), followed immediately (fol. 42v) by the distich³² which stands at the beginning of Alcuin's *Orthography*. The next text, designated in the catalogue as item (6), "Dictionarium per alphabeti ordinem" (fol. 42v), is the first line of Alcuin's *Orthography*, which does not, however, continue beyond folio 42v. At any rate, on folio 43, I noted the passage *coenobium a communi vita*, which is Bede's *Orthography* (Keil, *op. cit.*, VII, 265. 27). This continues to folio 53v, *unguentum non ungentum dicitur* (*ibid.*, p. 294. 26), which is the end of Bede (lacking the final paragraph). The two following items belong to the beginning of Bede: (7) "De litterarum significatione" (fol. 53v), *A littera etiam* (the first line of Bede [Keil, *op. cit.*, p. 261. 3]); and (8) "Dictionarii fragmentum" (fol. 53v), *Auscullo suasori*, etc. (*ibid.*, p. 262. 7).

Paris 13025 illustrates the deficiencies of the catalogue of our most important collection of classical manuscripts. The codex is described thus in Delisle's catalogue. "Traité de grammaire, parmi lesquels sont ceux de Servius et d'Asper.—IX s." It consists of 168 folios; the texts of Servius (*De finalibus*) and Asper cover folios 12–23, inserted in the grammar of Donatus (fols. 1–30v). Short tracts and excerpts, mostly grammatical, occupy the first part of the manuscript (fols. 1–74v); selections from Isidore (fols. 13–16, 35v–37v), a tract *De litteris* (fols. 24v–26v = Hagen, *op. cit.*, pp. 302–5); excerpts dealing with orthography (Isidore, Agroeius, Scaurus) and with declensions, conjugations, etc. Bede texts are found on folios 30v–33v: *De tropis*, (fols. 65–73v), *De arte metrica* (fols. 74–74v), and a strip containing a half-column (not numbered),

De schematibus. The strip was added at the end of Part I to complete the text. Part II (fols. 75–168v) contains the grammar of Pompeius. It had its own series of quaternion signatures (letters, on the verso of the last leaf), but all of these have been cut off or erased except the first two, *A* and *B* (fols. 82v and 89v). Another series was provided for this part, Roman numerals II–VIII, beginning with the third quaternion (II stands on fol. 105v; I is omitted on fol. 97v). This series was later replaced by a third, starting at the beginning of the entire manuscript, so that *A* became *K* (fol. 82v), *B* became *L*, etc. Finally, a late hand placed Roman numerals at the bottom of the first page of each quire.

Both parts of the codex were written in the same scriptorium and probably at the same time. The vertical rulings are alike up to folio 145, and the number of lines is the same. The codex came from Corbie and was doubtless written there. Paris 13024, which contains only Pompeius, is also a Corbie manuscript. The readings of the two texts of Pompeius are so nearly identical as to warrant the conclusion that they were copied from the same original. Insular abbreviations are found in most of the texts of 13025, but they are especially numerous in Bede.

I have reserved for especial discussion a manuscript of great interest from a paleographical and philological point of view. Naples IV. A. 34, a codex of nearly 300 folios, contains more than two dozen texts, mostly grammars, and includes such rare authors as Virgilius Maro and Julian of Toledo.³³ Except for the text of Virgilius Maro, the manuscript has been neglected³⁴ since it was brought to light

³³ The description given by Jannelli in his catalogue of the Bibliotheca Borbonica (Naples, 1827), pp. 25–30, is incomplete.

³⁴ Keil mentions the manuscript, *op. cit.*, V, 87, 330, and 527 n. He did not see the manuscript or use it.

³² Included in the catalogue with Cassiodorus.

by the great Cardinal Angelo Mai, who published the first edition of Virgilius Maro from it.³⁵ Later editors of Virgilius also used it—Huemer³⁶ and Stangl.³⁷

The date was given by Jannelli as "saec. XI vel XII" and by Mai as "saec. XI." Huemer, in an article preliminary to his edition,³⁸ repeated Meyncke's account of the manuscript: it consisted "aus zwei verschiedenen, auch nicht ganz gleichzeitig entstandenen Theilen, von denen der erste Theil von f. 1-167 (darunter f. 1-91 saec. X) reicht, der zweite Theil von f. 168-288, im XI. Jahrhundert von verschiedenen Händen geschrieben." In his edition Huemer³⁹ stated the case differently: "pars prior (f. 1-91) s. IX (ut Bethmanno obiter inspicienti visum est) vel X . . . posterior vero pars paulo post scripta est." Stangl⁴⁰ assigns folios 1-167 to the tenth century and 168-288 to the eleventh.

There is no doubt that folios 1-91 constitute a separate part of the codex. The quaternions are numbered from I to X; the last gathering, folios 87-91 (3+2), has no signature. Bede's *Orthography* (fols. 82v-91v) ends on the next to the last line of folio 91v, and below stands the direction to the scribe: *hic finem huius facies libri*. The number of lines to the page is 41. The grammar of Pompeius occupies folios 1-82v. Two folios are missing at the beginning of the codex. They did not contain the beginning of Pompeius but rather the *De partibus orationis* (Keil, *op. cit.*, V, 134. 3), *ipsam rem exprimat . . . seiungat* (*ibid.*, p. 137. 17). The actual beginning of Pompeius is found on folio 59 (middle), i.e., the quaternions were misplaced in the archetype.

The script of this part of the codex can with certainty be assigned to the ninth century. Huemer's caution about Bethmann's dating (*obiter inspicienti*) was not justified. Bethmann was one of the best judges of his day on the age of a manuscript. The abbreviations and ligatures cannot be later than the ninth century. The symbol for *-tur* is regularly *-i*, frequently changed to *-t*; suprascript *a* is found in ligature with *n*, subscript *i* occurs with *d*, ligatures with *r* are common, *ra*, *rrs*, *rs*, *ru*; especially notable is the frequent ligature of *o* with *t* (in *potest*); *ic* for *a* occurs once or twice; the Bede text also has open *a*.

The remainder of the codex is also to be considered as a unit. Folios 92-283 are arranged, without exception, in quaternions—a rather surprising fact in a manuscript of this size, with such a miscellaneous content and so many scribes taking part. The first 9 gatherings have letters as quire signatures at the bottom of the first leaf; in the tenth the signature (*K*) appears on the verso of the last leaf (fol. 171v); after that the signatures appear only on the last leaf of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and sixteenth gatherings (*N*, *O*, *Q*); the last (incomplete) gathering is folios 284-89. The unity of Part II is further shown by the fact that, after the first gathering, no text begins at the beginning of a quire. The number of lines is 41, the same as in Part I, up to the eleventh gathering (fols. 172-79), though the written space is much larger. From here on, the number of lines is 40 (fols. 168-268 are described by some as a separate part of the codex; 16 lines are vacant at the bottom of folio 167v, and there is a change of scribe beginning with folio 168). Folio 92 does not show signs of wear and tear, i.e., it did not remain the first folio of a codex very long.

Part II can be assigned to the ninth

³⁵ *Auctores classici*, V (Romae, 1833), 1-149.

³⁶ Teubner ed., 1881.

³⁷ *Virgiliana*, Programm (Munich, 1891).

³⁸ *Sitzungsber. d. phil.-hist. Cl. d. kaiserl. Akad. d. Wissenschaften.*, XCIX (Wien, 1882), 509-59.

³⁹ P. vi.

⁴⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 125.

century also. The cursive features of the script are not so pronounced as in Part I but, in character and number, are sufficient to exclude the possibility of a tenth- or eleventh-century scribe; we find: suprascript *a* with *n*, *r*, and *x*; open *a* (frequent); the cursive *c* (broken-backed); cursive *e* with *m* and *s*; *r* in ligature with *e*, *n*, *o*, *u*, and *ot* as in Part I (fols. 130, 140, 142, 161v, 191v); *h* with a slanting, broken shaft.

The manuscript was written when the abbreviations were in a state of flux; competing symbols are still struggling to survive. The symbol \dot{t} for *-tur*, which had the upper hand in Part I, continues to the end of the codex but is losing ground, and \dot{t} is taking its place; alternative forms with the suprascript sign taking an angular form, a semicircular form, or one with a loop at the top are also competitors. The comma for *-us* is frequent with *n* for *-nus* (also for *nunc*), with *r* for *-rus* (also for *-rum*, three times on fol. 154), and even for *-tus*, generally when there is no danger of confusion (cf. on fol. 166v *u terminat [-tus]*, *corripit [-tur]*); a similar uncertainty exists for *ut* and *uel*; e.g., $\dot{v}=ut$ (fols. 157v, 160v; the scribe himself did not understand); $\dot{u}=uel$ (fol. 157v); $ut=uel$ (fol. 161); $\bar{u}=ut$ (fol. 161). Such confusion is scarcely possible in a tenth-century manuscript.

The history of the codex has not been determined. Huemer in discussing the *Memoriale de libellis fratris Uuigradi*, a list of books containing some 25 items found on the last leaf (fol. 289), which he assigns to the twelfth century, points out that Wattenbach made mention of a Wicradus in the twelfth century (the date is wrong; Wattenbach definitely says 1060-75).⁴¹ Stangl,⁴² discussing Huemer,

says that he does not know whether Huemer accepts the identity of the two Wicgrads. He himself does. He quotes Wattenbach to the effect that Otloh of Freising not long before 1062 wrote the life of St. Nicolaus "petente Wicrado." This was the beginning of what seems to be a little comedy of errors. Wattenbach does say that the *Vita* was written at the request of the abbot Wicgrad, but he tells us that he was the abbot of Fulda (1060-76) and that his name, except in this passage, was Widerad—the latter is the name found in the necrology and list of abbots of Fulda—any connection, therefore, between the abbot of Fulda and the *Memoriale* of the humble *frater Uuigradus* would seem rather nebulous. It would be very unlikely that the head of the greatest library in Germany, the primate of all the abbots of Germany and Gaul, would concern himself with such an insignificant array of books as this or that the list would be of sufficient interest to cause it to be recopied in the following century. The book list is generally dated *saec.* XII, which seems to me much too late. I doubt if it is later than *saec.* X, which would exclude the abbot of Fulda, whether Widerad or Wicgrad. Neither Wattenbach nor Huemer actually expressed an opinion as to the identity of Uuigradus. On the strength of his identification Stangl⁴³ proceeded to claim all the important manuscripts of Virgilius Maro for Germany—Paris 13026 and Amiens 426, as well as Naples IV. A. 34 (=N). The first two, he says, themselves furnish proof, the third is a matter of conjecture. The Parisinus has the library mark *ex Corbiensi monasterio*, while the Ambianensis reads *Monasterii S. Petri Corbeiensis*. Stangl confused the two centers, *Corbeia (vetus)*, and *Corbeia nova*, a daughter-monastery. The mention of the patron saint "S. Petri" identifies the

⁴¹ *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*, II⁴, 55 (= II⁵, 66), n. 4.

⁴² *Op. cit.*, p. 125.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

monastery as the French Corbie, not the German Corvey. The story of the dispersal of the Corbie library is familiar. The greater part of its manuscripts went to St. Germain and from there to Paris. Others went direct to Amiens. The catalogue of the Amiens library⁴⁴ contains a list of over 300 Corbie manuscripts now in Paris and more than 165 at Amiens. No Corvey codex has been reported from Paris and Amiens. Manitius⁴⁵ repeats Stangl's error in regard to the Ambianensis but not the Parisinus. Stangl, however, seemed a little uncertain about the German origin of N: "Die Wanderung des MS von Deutschland nach Italien können wir nicht beweisen, noch weniger aber ihre Möglichkeit bestreiten."⁴⁶ The second statement can be challenged. Paleography is not an exact science, positive proof is often impossible, but in this case a mass of evidence can be presented sufficient to amount to a practical demonstration.

The character of the script would seem to point not to Germany but to northern Italy⁴⁷ and to Bobbio as the scriptorium. The codex presupposes a large establishment capable of producing books of some size. There was a considerable number of scribes, who wrote an informal, noncalligraphic hand of a cursive type, with "Merovingian" features, such as was current in northern Italy. The scriptorium was a center with Insular traditions; Insular abbreviations and Insular spelling were common; Insular writing practices are evident. The first two letters at the beginning of a sentence are large; initial letters are often surrounded with red dots. The first line of a text is occasionally written in large, stiff Insular letters, e.g., the

beginning of Consentius (fol. 92) and of Phocas (fol. 153). Insular letters occasionally crop out in the text, especially *g*.

The contents of the codex point to Bobbio. For grammatical texts this library was unsurpassed in the eighth and ninth centuries. In Italy no center even remotely approached it. Almost all the texts of any length in N are listed in the Bobbio catalogue. The missing items may well be included in Nos. 446-65 of the catalogue, "libros diversos de grammatica XX."⁴⁸

There is a close parallelism between the selections in N and the most popular grammars in the Bobbio library, in contrast with the other leading libraries of the time, as far as we can judge from contemporary catalogues—Consentius is represented at Bobbio by 3 copies, at Lorsch and St. Emmeram by 1 each; Agroecius by 3 manuscripts at Bobbio, at St. Gall and Reichenau by 1 each; the same figures apply to Capser; Bobbio had 3 manuscripts of Eutyches, counting 2 volumes listed in the catalogue among the grammars (Nos. 412, 413) as "libros ouricis duos";⁴⁹ St. Emmeram had 5 copies, Lorsch 3, Reichenau and Freising 1 each; Bobbio had 5 copies of Phocas, and Lorsch, Murbach, and York 1 each. Bobbio had 4 manuscripts of Pompeius, 1 of which was among the books presented by Dungal the Irishman. The other 3 (Becker, *op. cit.*, p. 69, Nos. 401-3) are marked "sed non plenarios"; this may have significance in view of the fact that N looks incomplete (see above, p. 83). At Reichenau there were 4 copies of Pompeius; and at San Riquier, Freising, St. Gall, Cologne, Murbach, and York 1 each. The only important exception is Diomedes, which is

⁴⁴ *Catalogue général*, XIX (1893), v-vi, xcix.

⁴⁵ *Op. cit.*, I, 121.

⁴⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 125.

⁴⁷ According to Meyncke (Huemer's ed., p. viii), it is not unlike the script of Monte Cassino.

⁴⁸ Becker, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

⁴⁹ Cf. the spelling in the twelfth-century catalogue of Arras (Becker, *op. cit.*, p. 254, No. 18, *liber Euricii*).

not listed in the catalogue,⁵⁰ though Bobbio certainly possessed a copy; San Riquier, St. Gall, and St. Emmeram had 1 each.

That Bobbio possessed a copy of Virgilius Maro is not surprising, for he was a favorite of the Irish grammarians. He was also popular with the Anglo-Saxons and was used by Aldhelm, Bede, and Boniface. He is not mentioned in the Bobbio catalogue; but extracts from his work are found in a Bobbio codex, the ninth-century MS Nancy 317 (354), folios 1-52v (53-55v are blank). These are followed by Servius *De finalibus* (fols. 56-62) and this, in turn, by a small corpus of 3 texts—Sergius *De litteris*, Victorinus *De ratione metrorum*, "Metrorius" *De finalibus*, and an anonymous paragraph *De cesuris*. This combination of Virgilius and the grammatical corpus occurs only in this manuscript of Nancy and in N. The corpus is contained in another Bobbio codex, a unique collection of grammatical texts that form Part II of the famous palimpsest Naples 2 (*olim* Vienna 16), written early in the eighth century.

Bobbio possessed a copy of Diomedes as early as the eighth century. Traube pointed out⁵¹ that the archetype of the codex from which Adam of Worms made a copy for Charlemagne (a. 780) and from which the surviving manuscripts descended was written in the Irish cursive script of Bobbio. Diomedes was also used in the anonymous commentary on Donatus found in the Ambrosian MS L. 22 sup., which I have tried to show elsewhere⁵² was compiled at Bobbio.

Some inferences may be drawn from the book list of Wigradus. The Anglo-

Saxon element is emphasized by the various works of Bede that he possessed: the commentaries on Genesis, on Proverbs, on the Acts of the Apostles, and on the Apocalypse, and a penitential. Connection with Bobbio is suggested by one title, *Quaterniones in titulis psalmorum expos. Bedae*. This same title is found in the Bobbio catalogue (No. 613), the only occurrence in the older medieval catalogues. Morin⁵³ called attention to the presence of this item in the Bobbio catalogue and mentioned 3 manuscripts that contain the work. Laistner added 3 more. I found an Italian manuscript of the tenth century—No. 249 in the library of Subiaco, a center associated with the early years of St. Benedict.

The affiliations of most of the texts in N are clearly French, in particular with the important centers Corbie and Fleury. Phocas and Virgilius Maro are combined in the Naples and Amiens (Corbie) manuscripts. The text of Pompeius is closest to that of the Corbie MS 13025. Significant perhaps is the item in the catalogue of the Bobbio library: Nos. 401-3, *libros Pompeii III sed non plenarios*. As we have seen, the Naples manuscript was (only) apparently defective, since, owing to misplaced gatherings in the archetype, the beginning of the text is found on folio 59. The 3 manuscripts may have been copies of the same archetype.

A connection between Corbie and Bobbio in the early ninth century is indicated by the fact that Wala, abbot of Corbie (a. 826) retired to Bobbio and was chosen abbot of that monastery. He died in 836.

There are several bits of evidence that point to Fleury and neighboring centers. The text of Julian of Toledo found in N is French. The manuscripts of Julian fall into two classes—a French class, consist-

⁵⁰ Manitius (*op. cit.*, I, 521) would explain the omitted item by saying that that part of the Bobbio catalogue which is devoted to grammars is defective.

⁵¹ *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, III (1920), 113.

⁵² "The Palimpsests of Bobbio," *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, VI (Città del Vaticano, 1946), 179.

⁵³ *Revue Bénédictine*, XI (1894), 289-95.

ing of Bern 207 from Fleury and Vat. Reg. 1586, also from Fleury. The oldest manuscripts of the other class are German.⁵⁴

The text of Consentius found in N agrees with that of Leyden Voss. O. 37, a French manuscript, and Ambrosianus B. 71 sup., not a Bobbio codex as sometimes stated but brought to the Ambrosian from Avignon. It also shares readings with Bern 432, from Micy on the Loire.

Excerpts from Virgilius Maro and Julian of Toledo are found in an anonymous grammar contained in Bern 123 (fols. 1-31v),⁵⁵ a manuscript which once belonged to the library of Fleury. The grammar also includes excerpts from Pompeius and Consentius.

To sum up: The Naples codex is a

monument to Irish and Anglo-Saxon scholarship. It contains the works of three great Anglo-Saxon writers—Bede, Aldhelm, and Alcuin—and of the French Virgilius Maro, a century earlier than Bede; and Julian of Toledo, a contemporary of Aldhelm, both of whose works owe their preservation to the Irish and Anglo-Saxon monks. The grammars of Consentius, Eutyches, Diomedes, and probably Phocas have an Insular tradition. Most of the texts show Insular influence in varying degrees. There is no evidence whatever for a German origin of this codex. Both the paleographical and the philological evidence point to northern Italy and Bobbio. The affiliations of the texts are French, not German—the centers are Corbie and the monasteries in the region of the Loire.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

⁵⁴ See Beeson, *Miscellanea Fr. Ehrle*, I (1924), 66.

⁵⁵ See Hagen, *op. cit.*, pp. ccxx ff. and 189 ff.

NOTES ON THE THRACIAN PHOROS

CHARLES EDSON

THE publication of the *Athenian Tribute Lists*¹ has marked an epoch in the study of the fifth century, and it is hardly necessary here to add to the praise which "this noble work"² has so justly received. The aim of this paper is modest: it is primarily to re-examine the existing evidence for the location of certain cities which are entered in the Thracian panel of the tribute lists. The point of view is that of a student of Macedonian, not Athenian, history; and hence the places here considered are among those which were, or are now thought to have been, in the sphere of interest of the Argæad kings. Much of what follows may seem nagging and picayune argument over minor points, but an investigation into problems of ancient historical geography must necessarily be concerned with detail. In brief, it is my contention that the tribute lists offer no evidence for Athenian control of any place on the north coast of the Thermaic Gulf north of Cape Aineia during the fifth century or on the west coast of the gulf before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War.³ The northern and western shores of the gulf were Macedonian territory. By contrast, the consistent Athenian interest in the Strymon region is notable. There has also been occasion to touch on aspects of the relations between Athens and the Macedonian

monarchy and on points in the historical geography of the Macedonian area.⁴

Alviārai, Alveārai, Alveiārai
(Pp. 220-21, 464-65)

The editors rightly place Aineia on the great promontory, Megalo Karaburnu. To the evidence which they adduce may be added Livy's statement that Aineia was 15 Roman miles from Thessalonica by sea.⁵ The actual distance from Salonica by sea to the modern fort at Megalo Karaburnu is a little over 11 English miles. This is decisive support for the proposed location. Indeed, there are few sites in the north Aegean whose locations can be so accurately determined by literary evidence alone.⁶

⁴ Each city discussed below is listed in alphabetical order with its ethnic in the form (or forms) which appear in the tribute lists. After the ethnic are added two references to *ATL*, I; the first is to the pages of the Register where the city's record is displayed, the second to the geographical discussion in the Gazetteer. All map references, unless otherwise specifically stated, are to the recent British General Staff Maps (1:100,000), GREECE. Each sheet is designated by its number and name, e.g., E. 9, POLYTIROS. Because of their large scale and grid, which permits exact topographical reference, these sheets are of great value for serious studies in the historical geography of mainland Greece. Modern place names, with rare exceptions, are spelled as they appear on these maps. It is to be noted that many of the local place names in Macedonia have been changed. This can be a fruitful source of error, since many of the new official names are antique (or pseudo-antique) and have been given to localities often without any certainty that the ancient name corresponds at all to the modern site. To avoid possible confusion I have frequently used the older form of the modern place name.

⁵ Livy xlv. 10. 7: "... ommissaque Thessalonicae oppugnationse Aeniam inde petunt, quindecim millia passuum ea urbs abest."

⁶ The editors appropriately cite [Scymnus] 627-28: *καί φανται τὴν ἑκταν δι τὴν καλούμενην / Ἀλβειαν*. Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Roman Antiquities* i. 49. 4 also associates Aineia with a promontory: *πρὸς Ἀφροδίτην ἰδρύσαντο ἐν τῶν ἀπορρηγμένων ὁδοῦ καὶ πόλιν Ἀλβειαν ἑκτίσαν*.

¹ B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery, and M. F. McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists*. Vol. I. Cambridge, Mass., 1939. Pp. xxxii + 605, with 25 pls. and map. Cited hereafter as "*ATL*, I."

² The phrase is that of A. W. Gomme in *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, I (Oxford, 1945), 33, n. 1.

³ So Gomme, *ibid.*, p. 215.

However, this certain location has been complicated with the editors' reliance on Lycophron *Alexandra* 1236-37 as their chief source:⁷

ὅς [Aeneas] πρῶτα μὲν 'Ραϊκήλον οἰκῆσει μολών,
Κισσοῦ παρ' αἰπὺν πρῶνα.

Kissos they equate with Megalo Karaburnu itself, abandoning the traditional identification of Kissos with Mount Khortiatitis (Chortiach), southeast of Salonica.⁸ But this new identification cannot be reconciled with other evidence. Xenophon (*Cynegeticus* 11. 1) speaks of Kissos, a home of big game, as a mountain "above Macedonia" (*Κίτρον τὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς Μακεδονίας*), a phrase which can never have been used to describe Megalo Karaburnu.⁹ In this passage Xenophon associates Kissos only with such high mountains as Pangaeum, the Mysian Olympus, the Pindus, and Nysa in Syria. In such company Megalo Karaburnu is simply out of place.¹⁰ Furthermore, Lycophron by no means states that Aeneas settled on Kissos. *Κισσοῦ παρ' αἰπὺν πρῶνα* need only mean that Aeneas settled beside, or near, or in the vicinity of, Kissos. We are not required to take

πρῶν in its meaning of "foreland," "headland," or "promontory," for the word can mean simply a high mountain or peak, as in Aeschylus (Frag. 12, ed. Smyth in the "Loeb Classical Library"):

Παγγαίου γὰρ ἀργυρήλατον
πρῶν' ἀστραπῆς (πίμπλησι) πευκάεν σέλας.

Pangaeum is not a promontory. The steeply rising Mount Khortiatitis, very slightly less than 4,000 feet high,¹¹ is only about 18 miles northeast of Megalo Karaburnu. There is, then, no cogent reason to abandon the identification of Kissos with Khortiatitis, which so well fulfils Xenophon's description. Lycophron, who is after all a poet, not a descriptive geographer, can quite correctly speak of Aineia as situated "beside the steep crag of Cissus."¹²

By equating Kissos with Megalo Karaburnu, the editors find themselves forced to take Rhaikelos as a synonym for Aineia.¹³ But Rhaikelos is the name of the region in which the settlement was made, not the colony itself: *οἰκεῖν*, not *οἰκίζειν*. Obviously, the whole point of these lines of the *Alexandra* is the founding of Aineia by Aeneas. Hence Lycophron cannot mean that Aeneas founded Rhaikelos. In his usual style of calculated enigma, he mentions the region in which Aineia was founded instead of spoiling the puzzle by calling a spade a spade.¹⁴ It has already

⁷ *ATL*, I, 465: "Perhaps the most exact indication, when translated out of the riddling form, is in Lycophron 1236. . . ." In fact, the location of Aineia can be established without any recourse whatsoever to Lycophron. Lycophron is important only for Rhaikelos.

⁸ Oberhummer, "Kissos" (2) and (3) in *RE*, Vol. XI, col. 522, with references there cited.

⁹ When Xenophon wrote, the territory of the Argead monarchy did not extend south of Anthemus, which is the valley of the modern Vasilikotikos (Vasilika Deresi) River, southeast of Salonica and directly south of Mount Khortiatitis. And in the generation before Philip II the Argead hold on Anthemus seems to have been precarious (cf. Demosth. 6. 20).

¹⁰ The actual Cape Megalo Karaburnu proper does not rise to an elevation of over 54 meters (see D. 8, *THESSALONIKI*, grid O-7829). And one must proceed inland from the cape for over 6 miles before coming to a height of over 200 meters (E. 8, *EPANOMI*, grid O-910234, south of Kardhara). The highest point in the whole area south of the Vasilikotikos Valley and east of the coast appears to be the height near Vavdhos (E. 9, *POLYTIROS*, grid P-194173), 938 meters; but this is around 30 miles east of Megalo Karaburnu. The gradually rising broken country east of the cape cannot be made into a high mountain.

¹¹ D. 8, *THESSALONIKI*, grid P-026362, gives the summit of Khortiatitis as 1,201 meters, thus 3,940 feet. The older British General Staff Map No. 2097, sheet "Mt. Athos," dated October, 1908, gives the height of "Chortiach" as 3,937 feet.

¹² The rendering of A. W. Mair in the "Loeb Classical Library." It is, of course, quite gratuitous to connect Kissos with Kithas (*ATL*, I, 465 and n. 2, 502, 540-41).

¹³ *ATL*, I, 465, n. 2: "Lycophron is certainly speaking of Aineia and Cape Aineia; if Rhaikelos and Kissos are not proper synonyms for these, then his evidence is of no use for siting Rhaikelos and Kissos. We see no reason, however, to doubt that they are proper synonyms."

¹⁴ So taken by A. W. Mair in the "Loeb Classical Library": "He shall first come to occupy Rhaecelus by the steep crag of Cissus."

been shown that the identification of Kissos with Megalo Karaburnu must be abandoned. It is therefore apparent that the ancient name of Megalo Karaburnu was Rhaikelos. Rhaikelos was the cape on which Aineia was situated.

The supposed identity of Rhaikelos with Aineia has led the editors to the conclusion that Aineia was founded by Pisistratus.¹⁵ The evidence is Aristotle (*Ath. pol.* 15. 2): καὶ πρῶτον μὲν συνῴκισε (Pisistratus) περὶ τὸν Θερμαῖον κόλπον χωρίον ὃ καλεῖται 'Ραῖκηλος. But Aristotle says that the name of Pisistratus' foundation was Rhaikelos, the name, understandably enough, being taken from that of the territory in which the settlement was located. Had it, in fact, been named Aineia by Pisistratus, it is very odd that Aristotle does not say so, and even more striking that the sources preserve no trace of such a tradition, for Pisistratus was a figure in whom ancient writers were interested. Hellanicus of Lesbos, who wrote about a century after the death of Pisistratus and, among other works, composed an *Atthis* which took the history of Athens down through the fifth century,¹⁶ definitely brought Aeneas and his followers to Krousis, the territory in which Aineia was located, and very probably indeed attributed the founding of Aineia to Aeneas.¹⁷

¹⁵ *ATL*, I, 465, nn. 1 and 2.

¹⁶ *FGrH*, Vol. I, No. 4, Frags. 49, 170, and 172, pp. 120, 147-48.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, Frag. 31, p. 117. Jacoby (*FGrH*, Vol. I, pp. 444-45) has demonstrated that this long passage is an excerpt from Hellanicus. Hellanicus, as reproduced by Dionysius (I. 47. 6), says that Aeneas crossed the Hellespont to the nearest peninsula extending from Europe, Pallene by name. Here the name "Pallene" is extended to include the area north of the Isthmus of Potidaea. But the decisive point is that Dionysius states that the territory where Aeneas landed was inhabited by a Thracian tribe allied to the Trojans, Κρουσαίων καλούμενον. The territory was therefore Krousis, precisely the region at the northern end of which was Aineia (cf. Herod. vii. 123. 2). Dionysius (I. 48. 1), with the utmost formality, cites Hellanicus' Τρωικὰ as his authority for this narrative. In the excursus running from I. 48. 1 through 49. 3, Dionysius discusses different versions of the wanderings of Ae-

That Aineia was the foundation of Aeneas was the opinion of antiquity without exception, including the inhabitants of Aineia, whose unique archaic tetradrachm bears on the obverse a representation of Aeneas carrying Anchises from Troy.¹⁸ It seems clear that the legend of the founding of the town by Aeneas must have been well established by the time of the minting of the earliest coins.¹⁹ In the early second century B.C. Aeneas was still worshiped at Aineia as κτίστης.²⁰

It seems best to conclude that Aineia represents a native place name having the same (Thracian?) root that appears in the name of Ainos, the well-known city at the mouth of the Hebrus²¹ and whose sound

neas. In I. 49. 4 he resumes his narrative. The first two sentences of 49. 4 return to and recapitulate the information already given in I. 47. 6, which, as we have seen, is taken from Hellanicus. The next sentence (see above, n. 6) describes the founding of Aineia by Aeneas. It is surely at least very probable that this, too, derives from Hellanicus. The next and concluding sentence of I. 49. 4 is a short excursus on the movement of the inhabitants of Aineia to Thessalonica by Cassander.

¹⁸ H. Gaebler, *Die antiken Münzen Nord-Griechenlands*, Vol. III, 2. Abt.: *Die antiken Münzen von Makedonia und Paionia* (Berlin, 1935), pp. 20-21, No. 33 on Tafel V at end. It is noteworthy that the legend on the coins of the city down until after the middle of the fifth century is ΑΙΝΕΑΣ, the genitive of the city's name, which can also be taken as the name of the founder in the nominative. The tetrobols down to ca. 425 B.C. have the head of Aeneas on the obverse. It is only on the bronze coins of the fourth century that the ethnic occurs (*ibid.*, p. 22).

¹⁹ So Köhler, *Berl. Sitzungsber.*, 1892, p. 345, n. 1: "Wenn die in dem Berliner Unicum bekannte Münze von Aineia mit dem Bilde des fliehenden Aineias . . . wegen des Stiles mit Recht in das sechste Jahrhundert gesetzt wird, so muss die Stadt Aineia, deren Name Veranlassung zur Localisirung der Ainelassage in dieser Gegend gegeben hat, älter sein als der σωτοκτίστης des Peisistratos." The editors (*ATL*, I, 465, n. 2) suggest that this tetradrachm "was issued by Peisistratos when he made a city of Rakelos."

²⁰ Livy xl. 4. 9: "Proficiscuntur ab Thessalonica Aeniam ad statum sacrificium, quod Aeneae conditori cum magna caerimonia quotannis faciunt."

²¹ Note that Vergil *Aen.* iii. 16-18 (apparently); Mela ii. 27; and Ammianus Marcellinus xxvii. 4. 13 make Aeneas found Ainos, as do the Scholia Vetera to Lycophron 1236. Conon (*FGrH*, Vol. I, No. 26, Frag. 1 [XLVI], p. 208) can say that Ainos became the later name of Aineia.

suggested Aeneas to the Greeks and hence, at an early date, gave rise to the legend of the city's foundation.²² The original inhabitants of Aineia were probably progressively Hellenizing barbarians, like their neighbors, the Bottiaean, farther to the south and east.

Pisistratus' settlement Rhaikelos, rather a fortified village or strong point than a true *polis*,²³ seems to have had a short and undistinguished life. It is not mentioned by any of the historians, geographers, or orators and is absent from the tribute lists, the Epidaurian list of *theorodokoi*,²⁴ and the great Delphian list of *theorodokoi*.²⁵ Aside from Aristotle, who had opportunities for very special knowledge of the Macedonian area,²⁶ and Lycophron, a most learned professional antiquary, Rhaikelos appears only in the scholia to Lycophron and in Stephanus, who clearly derives from the scholia. Both the scholia and Stephanus call Rhaikelos a *polis*, but their evidence on such a point is far from decisive.²⁷ Aristotle's statement permits only a general location of Rhaikelos in the region of the Thermaic Gulf; it is Lycophron who makes possible the specific localization. The Pisistratid foundation was soon surpassed by the

near-by Aineia, which in time gave its name to the promontory.

Rhaikelos, then, was created by Pisis-tratus on the promontory of the same name during his second exile. Herodotus (v. 94. 1) states that King Amyntas I offered Anthemus to Hippias after the latter's expulsion from Athens. Anthemus is the basin of the modern Vasilikotikos River, just northeast of Megalo Karaburnu and to the south of Khortiatiss.²⁸ As Busolt has seen,²⁹ there is a connection between this offer and Pisistratus' settlement at Rhaikelos. Indeed, the first contact between Athens and the Argead monarchy is surely to be attributed to Pisistratus himself.³⁰ It was from Rhaikelos as a base that Pisistratus set out for the lower Strymon and the Pangaeum region, where he procured the money and the men which made his final return to Athens possible.³¹ This was the first decisive intervention of the resources of the Macedonian area into the history of Athens.

²² For Anthemus see Hirschfeld, "Anthemus" (2), in *RE*, Vol. I, col. 2369; Geyer, *RE*, Vol. XIV, col. 655. Anthemus was originally a district or tribe, not a city (see Thuc. II. 99. 6). Gomme's statement (*op. cit.*, p. 218)—"Thuc. II. 99. 6 and 100. 4 suggest clearly that Anthemus was on the northern side of the mountains which separate Chalkidike from Mygdonia"—has no force. Amyntas would hardly have offered Hippias a region so far from the coast. Nor did the Argead kings possess the land to the north of the Khortiatiss-Kholomon range until after the defeat of Xerxes. The location of Rhaikelos is, in fact, excellent confirmation for the traditional location of Anthemus in the Vasilikotikos Valley. Cf. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte*, II (2d ed.; Gotha, 1895), 323, n. 4: "Es ist jetzt verständlich, weshalb der makedonische König Amyntas I dem vertriebenen Hippias das benachbarte Anthemus zum Wohnsitz anbot. Der durch den Synoikismos bei der dortigen Bevölkerung erlangte Einfluss der Peisistratiden sollte den Interessen Makedoniens dienstbar gemacht werden."

²³ *Loc. cit.*

²⁴ So Köhler, *op. cit.*, p. 345; and F. Cornelius, *Die Tyrannis in Athen* (Munich, 1929), p. 45.

²⁵ Aristotle *Ath. pol.* 15. 2: ἐκεῖθεν [i.e., from Rhaikelos] δὲ παρήλθεν εἰς τοὺς περὶ Πάγγαιον τόπους, ὅθεν χρηματίζαμενος καὶ στρατιώτας μισθώσμενος, ἰδὼν εἰς Ἑβέρτιον ὑπεκάρψατο πάλιν ἐπεὶ τότε πρῶτον ἀνασώσασθαι βλεψὼν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπεχείρει. . . . Herodotus (I. 64. 1) mentions only the Strymon.

²⁶ J. N. Svoronos (*L'Hellénisme primitif de la Macédoine* [Athens and Paris, 1919], p. 145) makes the interesting suggestion that the district *Κροσσαλή* or *Κρωστής*, beginning at Aineia and running south along the coast, may have been associated with Aeneas' wife, Creusa.

²⁷ As against *ATL*, I, 465, n. 2: "Pisistratus, when he made a city of Rakeles (Aristotle, 'Αθ. πολ., 15, 2). . . ." Aristotle hardly says this.

²⁸ *JG*, IV², 1, 94/95.

²⁹ A. Plassart, "Inscriptions de Delphes, la liste des théorodokes," *BCH*, XLV (1921), 1-85. Column III, ll. 51-99, pp. 17-19, is an important source for the historical geography of the north Aegean.

³⁰ Köhler, *op. cit.*, p. 345: "Aristoteles hat wahrscheinlich über den Aufenthalt des Peisistratos in Anthemus [sic!] nach lokalen Traditionen berichtet, die ihm von seiner Heimath her bekannt gewesen sind."

³¹ Stephanus is often careless and sometimes makes cities out of tribes and regions. Thus, in the Macedonian area, he makes *poleis* out of Bisaltia, Elimnia, Pieria, and Tymphaea (s.v. *Τύμφη*). The scholia (to I. 1238) can make a city out of Almopia.

Αἰσίων, Αἰσονῆς, ἡαίσων,
ἡαἰσόνιοι, ἡαἰσονῆς, Αἰσόνιοι

(Pp. 222–23, 466–67; see also p. 489)

Because the Aisonioi appear in a special rubric with Methone and Δικαιοπολίται Ἐρετριῶν (ATL, I, 450) as paying only the *aparkhe* from the *phoros* for the year 429/8,³² the editors plausibly locate Haison somewhere on the shores of the Thermaic Gulf. A more precise location is “tentatively” achieved by associating Haison with the stream Αἰσῶν mentioned by Plutarch (*Aemilius Paulus* 16. 5), together with the Λεῦκος, as flowing across the ground on which the battle of Pydna was fought. The arguments in support of this thesis are given by the editors in their discussion of the ancient geography of Pieria.³³ Plutarch’s Αἰσῶν they equate with the modern Pelikas River which flows into the Mavroneri (now officially “Aison”) about 7 kilometers from the coast. This is not the occasion to discuss the correctness of this last identification.³⁴ The essential point is that, by associating Haison with Plutarch’s stream Αἰσῶν and the latter with the Pelikas, the editors obtain a location for Haison at the modern Katerini,³⁵ thus in Pieria about 5 miles from the coast at a point which controls both the main routes running south from Macedonia to Thessaly—that along the coast over Herakleion and through Tempe and the alternative route over the Ayios Dhimitrios Pass to Olosson.

³² Also restored for the year 430/29 (ATL, I, 149, List 25).

³³ ATL, I, 489.

³⁴ The site of the battle is to be sought farther north near the village Korinos (E. 7, KATERINI, grid O-5509). The editors adopt the topographical conclusions of J. Kromayer (*Antike Schlachtfelder in Griechenland*, II [Berlin, 1907], 312–13), who makes the Mavroneri Plutarch’s Λεῦκος and the Pelikas his Αἰσῶν. For a variety of reasons the Mavroneri must be the ancient Baphyras.

³⁵ ATL, I, 467. All the antiquities at Katerini are Roman. None of them are *in situ*. Most of the inscriptions found there are known to have been brought from Dion.

In fact, the suggested location raises insuperable difficulties. Pieria was directly under the rule of the Argead kings; indeed, it was in a very special sense the Macedonian homeland.³⁶ Nothing is less likely than that the kings would have permitted Athens continuously to control so strategic a point. The only known city on the west coast of the Thermaic Gulf proper³⁷ ever subject to Athens was Methone; the first extant record of that city’s tribute is in the *aparkhe* rubric of List 26, 429/8, but the well-known Methone decrees (IG, I², 57) show that it was subject to Athens in 430/29.³⁸ It is absent from the full panels of 443/2 and 435/4.³⁹ This strongly suggests that Methone had been subject to the Macedonian monarchy and first became an ally of Athens about the time of the outbreak of the war between Athens and Perdiccas II.⁴⁰ Even after the alliance with Athens, Methone’s situation was difficult. From IG, I², 57 (ATL, I, 162–63, D3–5) it appears that, even in 430/29, Perdiccas was exerting severe pressure on Methone, a pressure which was still continuing in 426/5.⁴¹ The only

³⁶ Pieria is the Μακεδονία γῆ of Herod. vii. 127. 1. F. Geyer (RE, Vol. XIV, cols. 649–50, and *Makedonien bis zur Thronbesteigung Philipps II* [Munich, 1930], p. 9) does not grasp the significance of Herodotus’ remark.

³⁷ For Herakleion and Othoros see below, pp. 96 ff. and 99.

³⁸ Methone is restored with great probability by the editors in the list of 432/1; here the payment is preserved and is the same as that of 429/8, on which only the *aparkhe* was paid. The editors restore the entire *aparkhe* rubric in the list of 430/29, though no traces are preserved.

³⁹ ATL, I, 338–39.

⁴⁰ The fact that Methone, like Pydna, struck no coins during the fifth century (Gaebler, *op. cit.*, II, 78–79) supports the view that it was not independent.

⁴¹ Note that Methone, unlike the site proposed for Haison, was located on the coast and hence could receive direct support from Athens. In 430/29 Perdiccas was making it difficult for Methone to have access to the sea, was interfering with the city’s trade, and was moving troops across its territory (IG, I², 57. 18–23). In 426/5 it became necessary for Athens to permit Methone to import Pontic wheat and to free the city from all the obligations to which the other cities of the empire were subject, unless Methone were specifically

other Greek city of the Pierian coast⁴² was Pydna, which never appears in the tribute lists and is known to have been subject to Macedon.⁴³ And there are other considerations which definitely exclude the proposed location of Haison. From Herakleion (Platamona) to well north of Cape Atheridha the Pierian coast is simply an open beach. There are no harbors or elevations of any kind. All the points on this coast are simple *σκάλας*, open roadsteads. Under such circumstances, without the use of harbors or citadels, it would have been hardly possible for a naval power like Athens permanently to control an inland Pierian city. And no ancient source attests a city named *Αἷων* in Pieria. To sum up: There is no evidence for any Athenian control along the west coast of the Ther-

maic Gulf before 432/1 and then only of Methone, which was at least 15 miles north of the site suggested for Haison and, unlike that site, was on the coast. But Haison's record in the tribute lists is very complete.⁴⁴ It paid in 451/0, 450/49, [448/7], [447/6], [446/5], 444/3, 443/2, [442/1], 441/0, 440/39, 436/5, 435/4, 433/2, 432/1, and, in the *aparkhe* rubric with Methone and Dikaia, in [430/29] and 429/8. That the Macedonian kings for over twenty years permitted Athens to control a town on the Pierian plain at a point which could dominate the main land routes from Macedonia to the south is highly improbable.

For the above reasons it seems best to place Haison somewhere on the eastern shore of the Thermaic Gulf. Indeed, one may suggest that Haison may well be identical with *Αἷσα*, for variant forms of the terminations of ethnics and place names do occur in the tribute lists. Haisa is listed as one of the five cities of Krousis which appear only in a special rubric of the list of 434/3.⁴⁵ Haisa is absent from the full panels of 443/2 and 435/4, as well as from the full rubrics of 429/8. In all these years Haison appears. Haison is not present in the extant portion of the Thracian panel of 434/3, which is largely, though not entirely, complete. Its presence in this panel, therefore, cannot be absolutely excluded. But the evidence as it stands today permits the identification of Haisa with Haison. If this be admitted, the localization of Haison is no longer a problem.⁴⁶

named in the relevant decree (II. 34-47). These last provisions show that Athens had to make marked concessions to Methone to keep it in the empire at all. If Athens had such difficulties in the case of a coastal city to which her fleet gave her ready access, it would hardly have been possible for her to maintain control of a town in the Pierian plain with no natural defenses and some distance from the coast.

⁴² Gomme (*op. cit.*, p. 214) calls Dion in Pieria a Greek city. I know of no evidence that Dion was a Greek colony (see below, p. 97); nor is it correct to speak of Dion as "the border town of Macedonia on the coast towards Thessaly" (*ibid.*, n. 2). The site of Dion at the modern Malathria (E. 7, KATERINI, grid T-4795) is certain. In no strict sense can Dion be called a coastal city. The ancient site at Malathria is over 3 miles from the nearest point on the coast. Cf. Strabo (ed. Meineke) VII. Frag. 17: *ὅτι τὸ Δίον ἢ πόλις οὐκ ἐν τῷ αἰγιαλῷ τοῦ Θερμαίου κόλπου ἵσταν ἐν ταῖς ὕψευσι τοῦ Ὀλύμπου, ἀλλ' ὅσον ἐκτὸς ἐκίχεν σταδίους*. As so often in the excerpts from Strabo as given by his epitomators, the text shows signs of disturbance and corruption. The numeral is clearly corrupt or defective, for there is no reason to suppose that the Mavroneri has greatly extended the Pierian coast through alluvial deposits since antiquity in this particular area. Livy's description (xlv. 6. 15: "nam cum Olympi radices montis paulo plus quam mille passuum ad mare relinquant spatium, culus dimidium loci occupat ostium late restagnans Baphyri amnis, partem plantilae aut Iovis templum aut oppidum [i.e. Dion] tenet, . . .") does not actually refer to the distance between Dion and the coast but to the space between the lowest reaches of Mount Olympus and the sea.

⁴³ Thuc. I. 137. 1: *ἐς Πύδναν τῇν Ἀλεξάνδρου*. It was still Macedonian in 432 (*ibid.* 61. 2-3). Pydna did not strike coins in the fifth century (Gaeber, *op. cit.*, II, 105-6).

⁴⁴ The years inclosed in brackets indicate that the town has been restored by the editors.

⁴⁵ *ATL*, I, 146, List 21, col. VI, ll. 29-33. This rubric is restored by the editors in the assessment of 425/4: p. 156, A9, col. IV, ll. 83-85.

⁴⁶ Down to 435/4 the payment of Haison, where preserved and as restored (there is a small *epiphora* in 436/5), had been 1,500 drachmas. The payment of the five towns of Krousis (the Tindaloi, Kithas, Smilla, Gligonos, and Haisa) for 434/3 is 3,000 drachmas, precisely double the former payment of Haison. This sum

Βεργαῖοι

(Pp. 244-45, 474)

Berga is an admirable example of the kind of historical information we owe to the tribute lists. Strabo (vii, Frag. 36) states that Berga was a *κώμη* located approximately 200 stades to the north of Amphipolis among the Bisaltae (ἐν δὲ τοῖς Βισάλταις), thus to the west of the Strymon, over 20 miles inland.⁴⁷ [Scymnus] (ll. 653-54) agrees with Strabo in placing Berga κατὰ μεσόγειον.⁴⁸ The precise loca-

also appears in the assessment of 425/4, where the editors persuasively restore the five names. In 434/3, though the five towns are listed separately, they pay jointly. This probably indicates that we are not here confronted with true *apotaxis* (cf. *ATL*, I, T. 19 on p. 573 [Antiphon, Frag. 55, ed. Thalheim] and U. Kahrstedt, *AJP*, LVIII [1936], 428 f.). I suggest that Haison was the name by which the five communities, none of which appears independently in the tribute lists, had hitherto been collectively designated. This separate listing and doubled assessment of the five towns of Krousis lasted only for the year 434/3. Haison reappears in 433/2 and 432/1, paying a reduced assessment of only 1,000 drachmas as against 1,500 before 434/3; in 430/29 and 429/8 Haison pays only the *aparkhe* on the 1,000 drachmas. Athens, in view of the menacing tendencies in the Chalcidic area, abandoned the doubled assessment for the towns of Krousis and reduced their former collective tribute by one-third; possibly in 430/29 and certainly in 429/8 the towns were granted the further and considerable privilege of paying only the *aparkhe*. But in 425/4, confident of her position because of the victory at Pylos (Wade-Gery and Meritt, *AJP*, LVII [1936], 394), Athens could again assess them 3,000 drachmas, twice their original tribute. I am not sufficiently familiar with the evidence of the tribute lists as a whole to be able to give any reason for the separate listing of the towns of Krousis in 434/3 and in the assessment of 425/4. But the fact that these towns paid jointly and were jointly assessed hardly suggests that the separate listing of them indicates the dissolution, brought about by Athens, of a hitherto existing political union; collective payment of the tribute demanded common action and mutual arrangements.

⁴⁷ For the Bisaltae see (with caution) Oberhammer in *RE*, Vol. III, cols. 499-500.

⁴⁸ Stephanus' location, if it may be dignified as such—ἐν δὲ τοῖς Βισάλταις κατὰ τὴν Μεσογίαν—is too vague to be taken seriously and should not have been used by Svoronos (*op. cit.*, p. 103) as evidence that Berga was on the west coast of the Strymonic Gulf! Ptolemy's placing of Berga in Odontantike or Edonis (iii. 12. 28) need not be taken literally. Berga is obviously the *Βίρρη* of Hierocles (*Synecdemus* [ed. Burckhardt] 640. 6, p. 5). *Βίρρη* is now the official name of the village Kopach (Κοπάχη), which is situated about 9 kilo-

meters west-northwest of Nigrita (1:100,000, GREECE, D. 9, NIGRITA, grid P-2876). Three inscriptions preserved at Kopach have recently been published by J. Roger (*Rev. arch.*, XXIV [6th ser.; July-December, 1945], 37-43); they contain no place names.

⁴⁹ Casson's attempt at location (*BSA*, XXIII [1918-19], 33-35) is very attractive.

⁵⁰ *BCH*, LXII (1938), 37-41, and Pl. XIV.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

⁵² *Ill.* 12. 28. Gazoros is the new official name of the village Porna, which is about 5 kilometers due west of Nea Zikhna on the north side of the Angitis (Angitsa) basin (G. 10, DRAMA, grid P-6181). I do not know whether any archeological or epigraphic evidence has been discovered locally to support the new designation. See Roger, *op. cit.*, p. 39, n. 3.

⁵³ *Op. cit.*, p. 41.

⁵⁴ The only other epigraphic possibility is [Ἰγγαῖοι, Σίγγος in Chalcidice is geographically out of the question, and its correct ethnic is Σίγγιες. Stephanus gives this form but adds at the end of his article: καὶ Σίγγαῖοι. This last form probably derives from Thucydides (see A. B. West, *AJP*, LVIII [1937], 172). But Stephanus' dishonesty as regards ethnics is notorious; cf. L. Robert, *Etudes anatoliennes* ("Etudes orientales," Vol. V [Paris, 1937]), p. 556: "On sait, on l'on devrait savoir, qu'Étienne de Byzance a été, plus

meters west-northwest of Nigrita (1:100,000, GREECE, D. 9, NIGRITA, grid P-2876). Three inscriptions preserved at Kopach have recently been published by J. Roger (*Rev. arch.*, XXIV [6th ser.; July-December, 1945], 37-43); they contain no place names.

⁴⁹ Casson's attempt at location (*BSA*, XXIII [1918-19], 33-35) is very attractive.

⁵⁰ *BCH*, LXII (1938), 37-41, and Pl. XIV.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

⁵² *Ill.* 12. 28. Gazoros is the new official name of the village Porna, which is about 5 kilometers due west of Nea Zikhna on the north side of the Angitis (Angitsa) basin (G. 10, DRAMA, grid P-6181). I do not know whether any archeological or epigraphic evidence has been discovered locally to support the new designation. See Roger, *op. cit.*, p. 39, n. 3.

⁵³ *Op. cit.*, p. 41.

⁵⁴ The only other epigraphic possibility is [Ἰγγαῖοι, Σίγγος in Chalcidice is geographically out of the question, and its correct ethnic is Σίγγιες. Stephanus gives this form but adds at the end of his article: καὶ Σίγγαῖοι. This last form probably derives from Thucydides (see A. B. West, *AJP*, LVIII [1937], 172). But Stephanus' dishonesty as regards ethnics is notorious; cf. L. Robert, *Etudes anatoliennes* ("Etudes orientales," Vol. V [Paris, 1937]), p. 556: "On sait, on l'on devrait savoir, qu'Étienne de Byzance a été, plus

that the towns forming the pentapolis were in some proximity to each other. Since the location of Sirrai is fixed with certainty at Serres, Berga is also to be placed in the basin of the lower Strymon. Strabo's evidence is thus confirmed.⁵⁵

The placing of Berga over 20 miles inland on the west bank of the Strymon naturally raises the question of how Athens could bring into her empire, and continuously control, a point so far from the coast. Bisaltia was one of the regions acquired by the Argead monarchy after the collapse of Persian rule in the north Aegean, and Macedonian control was maintained throughout the fifth century.⁵⁶

qu'un rassembleur d'éthniques, un grand inventeur d'éthniques; un nom de lieu lui étant fourni par un auteur, il forge aussitôt un ethnique qui lui paraît vraisemblable.

⁵⁵ The register of the *theorodokoi* of the Asklepieion at Epidaurus (*JG*, IV², 1, 94. Ib. 1. 19), to be dated very close to 360 B.C., appears to list Berga between Amphipolis and Tragila; but, as West has shown (*op. cit.*, p. 161), the cities are listed in the order in which they were visited by the Epidaurian *theoroi*.

Berga's only famous son was the notorious Antiphanes, the Münchhausen of Hellenic antiquity. Schmid (*RE*, Vol. I, cols. 2521-22) dates him "spätstens im 3. Jhdt. v. Chr." But a fragment of Alexis—*Βεργαῖος ἰθαλός*—(see *LSJ* under *Βεργαῖος*) places Antiphanes definitely in the fourth century. The *theorodokos* in Berga is 'Αντιφάνης and, as Hiller suggests in his commentary, is very probably identical with the author. Antiphanes together with such figures as Asclepiades of Tragilos (*FGrH*, Vol. I, No. 12, pp. 166 and 484) and Zoilus of Amphipolis (*ibid.*, Vol. IIC, No. 71, pp. 103-4), is a part of the little flurry of literary activity which occurred in the Strymon area about the middle of the fourth century. Willmowitz (*Hermes*, XL [1905], 149-50) has shown the likelihood that Antiphanes had heard Plato. I have not seen O. Weinreich, "Antiphanes und Münchhausen, das antike Lügenmärlein von den gefrorenen Worten und sein Fortleben in Abendland," *Wiener Sitzungsber.*, 220, IV (1942), who also identifies the *theorodokos* of Berga with the author.

⁵⁶ Thucydides' evidence is formal (II. 99. 6): ἐπάρησαν δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν οἱ Μακεδόνες οὐτοί, ἃ καὶ νῦν ἐτι ἔχουσιν, τὸν τε 'Ανθεμόνωνα καὶ Γρηγορίωνα καὶ Βισαλτίαν. Early coins of Alexander I are direct copies of late archaic Bisaltic pieces and thus indicate that the king gained control of Bisaltia soon after the Persian defeat (see Svoronos, *op. cit.*, p. 102; also Gaebler, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, Pls. XII and XXVIII [cf. Nos. 1 and 2 on the latter plate with the Bisaltic coins on Pl. XII]). The silver mine near Lake Prasias which Alexander acquired after Xerxes' defeat (Herod. v. 17. 2) was in, or very near, Bisaltia.

The inclusion of Berga in the Athenian empire was an extension of Athens' power deep into territory recently added to the Argead kingdom by Alexander I. Were it not for the incontrovertible evidence of the tribute lists, one would hardly have thought any such Athenian intervention possible. But the lists are explicit. Berga paid tribute in 452/1, 451/0, and 447/6. It is absent from the full panel of 443/2 but reappears again in 435/4, 433/2, and 432/1. This reappearance is surely to be connected with the founding of Amphipolis by Athens in 437. The absence of Berga from the full panel of 430/29 is probably to be motivated by the hostilities between Athens and Perdiccas II. The editors restore the name of the town for the year 429/8,⁵⁷ but this is uncertain; [Σερμ]αῖοι is equally possible. Thereafter no record is preserved, but it is clear that Athens could hardly have kept Berga under her control after the liberation of Amphipolis by Brasidas in 424/3 and the resulting hostility of that city. Indeed, there are silver and bronze coins of the turn from the fifth to the fourth centuries which imitate those of Thasos and bear the legends ΒΕΡΓ, ΒΕΡΓΑΙ, and ΒΕΡΓΑΙΟΥ.⁵⁸ Given the dominant role of Thasos along this section of the northern Aegean coast at this time, the adoption of Thasian coin types by Berga is understandable.

The fact of continued Athenian control of Berga during a large part of the fifth century is certain. How was the control of a point so far in the interior maintained?

⁵⁷ *ATL*, I, 150, List 26, col. II, l. 32. The payment is not preserved.

⁵⁸ Svoronos, *op. cit.*, pp. 99-100; E. Babelon, *Traité des monnaies grecques et romaines*, Part II (Paris, 1928), Vol. IV, cols. 794-98. It is surely unnecessary to hold with Babelon that the form ΒΕΡΓΑΙΟΥ must be interpreted as an otherwise unattested personal name Βεργαῖος, which he takes to be that of a dynast. For Βίργη, Stephanus gives the variant Βίργιον, which may possibly be a defective form of Βεργαῖον. It is not apparent why H. Gaebler has excluded these pieces from his treatise on Macedonian coins.

The tribute lists make it plain that Berga was dependent on Athens long before the creation of a strong, permanent Athenian base at Amphipolis, though, of course, Eion and Argilos⁵⁹ could be used, less effectively, for that purpose. The disaster at Drabescus had shown once and for all the very real dangers of military operations in the Strymon region. From Plutarch (*Pericles* 11. 5) we learn that Pericles sent one thousand cleruchs to "settle with" the Bisaltae. A cleruchy of one thousand men could hardly install itself permanently among the Bisaltae by force of arms.⁶⁰ The date of this cleruchy cannot be determined with accuracy, and hence it would be very hazardous to identify it with Berga, quite apart from the fact that cleruchies did not normally pay tribute. The cleruchy in Bisaltia must have been established with something like the co-operation, or passive acquiescence, of the inhabitants and their suzerain, the Macedonian king.

Given the geographical factors involved, it is most improbable that the Athenian control of Berga was accomplished by out-and-out military conquest and was maintained by force. Instead, diplomatic pressure, backed by the threat of naval action, such as the blockade⁶¹ and raids⁶² on the coasts of the Macedonian homeland around the Thermaic Gulf, was responsible for this concession. Bisaltia, after all, was on the then extreme eastern

frontier of the monarchy,⁶³ and a degree of political influence or control by Athens could be permitted in this region which might be thought dangerous farther west. That Berga later struck coins may indicate a measure of *laissez faire* on the part of the kings, though it is perhaps more probable that the coinage dates from the period of Macedonian weakness after the death of Archelaus.

Ἡράκλειον

(Pp. 278-79, 489)

A Herakleion appears in the assessment of 421 and is restored by the editors in that of 425/4 (here the payment only is preserved but is the same amount as that of 421). Herakleion is not listed elsewhere in the extant portions of the tribute lists; it is absent from the full panels of 443/2, 435/4, 432/1, and 430/29. The editors identify the town with the Pierian Herakleion, which is certainly to be placed on the height overlooking the sea just to the north of the Platamona railroad station, the site of a magnificent Venetian citadel.⁶⁴ No other Herakleion is known in the Thracian district, and, though an argument from silence is usually hazardous, the editors' identification is to be accepted, since it is normal practice in the tribute lists for homonymous cities to be distinguished by descriptive phrases.

⁵⁹ From Thucydides we learn that the Odomanti (v. 6. 2) and the Edonians (iv. 107. 3) were independent under their own kings (cf. [Scylax] 66: *μετὰ δὲ Μακεδονίαν Στρυμόν ποταμὸς ὁὗτος διρίζει Μακεδονίαν καὶ Θράκην*). It was Philip II who first extended Macedonia east of the Strymon.

⁶⁰ E 7, KATERINI, grid T-543754. The location can be determined with certainty from Livy xlv. 8. 8-9. 2; note particularly that Popilius made his attack "terra marique . . . et classis adpulsa ab litore stabat." For the ancient remains see L. Heuzey, *Le Mont Olympe et l'Acarnanie* (Paris, 1860), pp. 91-93. For a history of the site (incomplete as to antiquity) with a description of the medieval fortifications and photographs, see 'Α. Βακαλόπουλος, "Τὸ Κάστρο τοῦ Πλαταμώνα," ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΑ (Σύγγραμμα Περιοδικὸν τῆς Ἑταιρείας Μακεδονικῶν Σπουδῶν), Θεσσαλονίκη, I (1940), 58-76; see also Oberhummer's article in *RE*, Vol. VIII, cols. 499-500.

⁵⁸ *ATL*, I, 232-33 and 469.

⁵⁹ Livy (i.e., Polybius) xlv. 30. 3, shows that even as late as 167 B.C. the Bisaltae still possessed a considerable military reputation: "pars prima Bisaltas habet, fortissimos viros."

The colony to Brea (*JG*, I, 45) has often been connected with this cleruchy (see Gomme, *op. cit.*, pp. 373-75, for discussion and references). Jacoby (*FGH*, IID, 379-80), in his commentary on Theopompus Frag. 145, goes much too far in unequivocally placing Brea in Bisaltia. It is simply not known if the colony at Brea had anything at all to do with the cleruchy.

⁶¹ E.g., Thuc. v. 83. 4.

⁶² E.g., *ibid.* vi. 7. 3.

Herakleion is first mentioned in the extant literature, about 360 B.C., by [Scylax] 66 as the "first city of Macedonia." But there is other evidence which shows that Herakleion existed in the fifth century. It is mentioned in his letter to Philip II by Speusippus,⁶⁵ who cites as his authorities Herodotus and Damastes. As Herakleion does not appear in Herodotus, Damastes remains as the source.⁶⁶ Damastes mentioned Herakleion in connection with Xerxes' invasion, and we must therefore conclude that Herakleion either existed at the time of the Persian Wars or at least by the time Damastes completed his history, at the latest well before the end of the fifth century.

The location is striking. The fortress rests on a steep bluff, which falls away abruptly to the sea. It completely dominates the important route from the Vale of Tempe into Pieria along the coast.⁶⁷ Both to the north and to the south of the citadel are open beaches on which triremes could land. An Athenian seizure of Herakleion by a *coup de main* would have been perfectly feasible. The possession of Herakleion would enable the Athenians to control the more important of the two chief routes from Macedonia south into Thessaly.⁶⁸

Gomme (*op. cit.*, p. 214) holds that Herakleion was "well to the south of the southern borders of Macedonia in the

fifth century." On the contrary, it seems definite that the town was Macedonian—indeed, that it was a Macedonian foundation.⁶⁹ The first two cities of Macedonia as one entered the kingdom from Thessaly via Tempe were Herakleion and Dion.⁷⁰ These are propagandist names: Herakleion is named after the heroic ancestor of the Argead dynasty and Dion after the divine father of Makedon, the eponymous forefather of the *Makedónes*.⁷¹ These names fit in perfectly with what is known of Argead propaganda in the fifth century, a propaganda which culminated in Euripides' *Archelaus*, and strongly suggest that Herakleion was a foundation of the dynasty. If so, there can be little question that Herakleion was Macedonian in the fifth century.

When Brasidas in 424 was introduced into Macedonia by the Perrhaebians (Thuc. iv. 78. 6), the first Macedonian city he reached was Dion. The fact that Dion is mentioned as Brasidas' point of arrival in Macedonia very probably indicates that the route taken from Thessaly was that from Olosson over the Ayios Dhimitrios Pass.⁷² Now this route is very much more difficult than the alternate and more important one through Tempe

⁶⁵ Speusippus (*op. cit.*, p. 8), in addressing Philip II, can say that the Greeks encountered Alexander I *ἐν τῷ ὑπέρτατῳ Ἡράκλειον*. Surely the implication here is that Herakleion at that time was Macedonian.

⁷⁰ So [Scylax] 66: ἀπὸ δὲ Πηγεῖοι ποταμοῦ Μακεδόνες εἰσὶν ἔθνη, καὶ κόλποι Θεσσαῖος. πρώτη πόλις Μακεδονίας Ἡράκλειον Δίων. The Delphian *theorodokoi* list (*BCH*, XLV [1921], 17, ll. 51–54) places Leibethroi between Herakleion and Dion, but this is because it was visited by the Delphian *theoroi*. Leibethroi seems not to have been on the coastal route proper but on the east slopes of Olympus. Oberhummer (*RE*, Vol. XII, col. 1858) has no real authority for placing it "am Fusse des Olympos" (Livy xlv. 5. 12 does not prove that Leibethroi itself was on the plain); Heuzey (*op. cit.*, pp. 93 ff.) puts Leibethroi near the modern Leptokaria (E. 7, KATERINI, grid T-4780).

⁷¹ Hesiod Frag. 3, in "Loeb Classical Library": § [Thyia] δ' ὅπου αὐτὴν διελθὼν τοῦ περὶ κερκεραῖον / οὔτε διὰ Μάγνητα Μακεδὼνα θ' ἰπποχάρμην.

⁷² So Gomme, *op. cit.*, p. 215, but hardly the "usual" route.

⁶⁶ E. Bickermann and J. Sykutris, "Speusipps Brief an König Philipp," *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl.*, LXXX, No. 3 (1928), 8.

⁶⁷ *FGH*, Vol. I, No. 5, Frag. 4, p. 154.

⁶⁸ The Salonica-Larissa railroad is forced to tunnel through the elevation on which the citadel stands. The strategic importance of Herakleion in Macedonian hands is well demonstrated by the difficulty which the Romans had in breaking into Pieria during the Third Macedonian War.

⁶⁹ The more western route over the Haliacmon and through the "Volustana" Pass, today the "Stena Portas," to Olosson can hardly have been of much importance to the Argead kings in the fifth century.

and along the coast over Herakleion. But if, in 424, Herakleion was in Athenian hands, as now appears from the editors' very probable restoration in the assessment of that year,⁷³ then the choice of the more difficult inland route becomes understandable. Herakleion in Pieria was controlled by Athens in 421 and, almost certainly, in 425/4. Athens acquired the town sometime after 430/29 in the course of her hostilities with Macedon. We owe our knowledge of this fact to the tribute lists.

It is interesting and significant to note that the record of Βορμίσκος (ATL, I, 248-49, 476) is identical with that of Herakleion. Bormiskos is missing from the full panels of 443/2, 435/4, 432/1, and 430/29. It appears in the assessment of 421/0 and is restored with great probability by the editors in that of 425/4 (here, too, the payment only is preserved). Bormiskos' payment was also identical with that of Herakleion—1,000 drachmas. Like Herakleion, Bormiskos also dominated and controlled a very important land route, that of the later Via Egnatia. The town was located on the narrow pass leading from Lake Bolbe to the west coast of the Strymonic Gulf, the Bogazi Rendinas, "Throat of Rendina."⁷⁴ The location is given with the utmost clarity by Thucydides (iv. 103. 1). By controlling Bormiskos, the Athenians dominated the chief route leading from Macedonia to the west coast of the Strymonic Gulf and on toward Amphipolis and the regions of the lower Strymon. Though it is nowhere specifically stated, it is very probable that Bormiskos had been Macedonian. Perdicas had permitted the Chalcidians to cultivate land in Mygdonia around Lake Bolbe as long as the war with Athens lasted (Thuc. i. 58. 2), but he had cer-

tainly not relinquished Macedonian sovereignty over the region,⁷⁵ and Thucydides (ii. 99. 4) also speaks of the Argeadae as having conquered the land "beyond the Axios up to the Strymon which is called Mygdonia." There can be little doubt that Bormiskos was Macedonian. Certainly by 421 and very probably by 425/4 Athens had succeeded in detaching from Perdicas the cities Herakleion and Bormiskos,⁷⁶ strategic points on the main routes from Macedonia to the south and to the east.⁷⁷

⁷³ Note particularly Thuc. i. 58. 2: τῆς *λαυροῦ* γῆς τῆς *Μυγδορίας*.

⁷⁴ I do not believe that, on the basis of Thucydides' account (iv. 103. 1-2) of Brasidas' remarkable march from Arnai through the pass at Bormiskos and on to Amphipolis, one would be justified in concluding that Bormiskos in the early winter of 424 was not under Athenian control or at least allied to Athens. Brasidas was desperately anxious to reach Amphipolis as soon as possible. He reached Bormiskos in the evening, fed his men, and pushed on. Had Bormiskos been hostile to him or even if it had contained an Athenian garrison, in view of his great objective it would not have been worth his while to delay to take the place. Brasidas' stop at or near Bormiskos was certainly brief. It is to be noted that Thucydides does not state that Brasidas entered or took the town; he merely says: "And having come about evening to the defile and Bormiskos and having dined, he went forward during the night." Any Athenian force there might have been in Bormiskos would surely have been small and designed only to hold the place against any ordinary attack. It would certainly not have been large enough to dispute Brasidas' passage through the defile. And the whole aim of Brasidas' operation was swiftness and secrecy. For these reasons I do not believe that this passage of Thucydides throws any light at all on the question of whether Bormiskos was or was not Athenian in 424. Here the evidence of the tribute lists becomes very relevant.

⁷⁵ The record of Τράλλος (or Τράγλιος) is also identical with that of Herakleion and Bormiskos, save that its payment was one talent (ATL, I, 426-27, 556). The site has been tentatively identified with the modern village Aidhonokhorion, about 6 miles west-northwest of Amphipolis across the Strymon (D. 10, *RODHOLIVOS*, grid P-5562). Its coinage (Gaebler, *op. cit.*, II, 131-32 and Pl. XXIV) shows that Trallos had not been subject to Macedon before coming under Athenian control by 425/4.

Argilos (ATL, I, 232-33, 469), located on the coast at Paliokeastro about 2 miles west of the Strymon mouth (D. 10, *RODHOLIVOS*, grid P-6354), appears to have been more or less continuously under Athenian control. Macedonian territory, therefore, did not extend along the coast actually up to the mouth of the Strymon. The absence of Argilos from the full panels of 435/4, the year after the founding of Amphipolis,

⁷⁵ ATL, I, 156, A9, col. IV, l. 108.

⁷⁴ D. 9, NIGRITA, grid P-4642-4943.

Ὀθόριοι, "Othoros"

(Pp. 358–59, 528, also 489)

The editors very tentatively suggest that the Othorioi may be identical with the "Oloros" mentioned by Pliny (*NH* iv. 34) as, seemingly, on the west coast of the Thermaic Gulf. "Pliny's *Oloros*, or possibly *Odoros*, between Pydna and the Haliacmon, ought not to be Aloros, which he places elsewhere in the next sentence" (*ATL*, I, 489). This suggestion is based on the assumption that Oloros (i.e., ΟΛΩΡΟΣ) may be a corruption of ΟΔΩΡΟΣ, which, in turn, is taken as a variant for "Othoros."

But here, too, we are confronted with Pliny's "known habits of contamination,"⁷⁸ for example: *Eordaea* (34), *Eordenses* (35); *Mygdones* (35), *regio Mygdoniae* (38); *Arethusii* (35), *Arethusa* (38); *Apollonia* (37), *Apollonia* (38);⁷⁹ *Heraclea Sintica* (35), *Heraclea* (38).⁸⁰ Following his usual practice Pliny has merely copied out in a disorganized form the contents of his (or his slaves') notebooks. Pliny is thus quite capable of listing Aloros once and then naming it again in the next sentence (particularly since in his notes the second reference to the city was in the ethnic form

and 432/1 very possibly reflects hostilities between Athens and Perdiccas. Before ca. 425/4 Athens seems to have controlled no point on the west coast of the Strymonic Gulf proper between Argilos and Acanthus except Stagelra (*ATL*, I, 412–13, 550; see also Oberhammer, *RE*, Zweite Reihe, Vol. III, col. 2125; the city itself was about 5 miles from the coast). In the assessment of 421/0 a Πείσειον appears (*ATL*, I, 384–85, 541), whose payment, like that of Herakleion and Bormiskos, is 1,000 drachmas. This the editors, citing Pliny (*NH* iv. 38) and Herodotus (vii. 115. 2), with great probability place on the peninsula which ends in Cape Elevthera (D. 10, *RODHO LIVOS*, grid P-699266) and separates the Gulf of Ierissós from the Strymonic Gulf proper. But Poseidon was surely never Macedonian until the reign of Philip II.

⁷⁸ *ATL*, I, 546.

⁷⁹ In both instances it is apparent from the context that the Mygdonian Apollonia is intended.

⁸⁰ The same Heraclea is named again under Thrace (iv. 42)!

Aloritae).⁸¹ It is surely best to regard the "Oloros" of the manuscripts as a simple corruption of Aloros, and hence there can be no connection with the Othoros of the tribute lists.

But even if Pliny's "Oloros" is retained as a separate (though otherwise quite unattested) city and its identity with the Othorioi of the tribute lists is assumed, there is no reason to take Pliny's apparent location of it at all seriously. This whole passage is filled with wrong, or at best hopelessly vague, locations: the Tymphaei placed between Heraclea Sintica and Torone (35); Pyloros (surely the Sithonian Piloros of the tribute lists) on the lower Axios (36); the Bottiaei near the Odrysian Thracians (40); Olynthos near Mount Pangaeum (42). Pliny simply cannot be used as a source for the location of Oloros.

Othoros' record of payment is also against the proposed location. It is known to have paid in 443/2, 442/1, 441/0, 436/5, 435/4, and 434/3 and appears in the assessment of 421. Othoros was thus subject to Athens for at least ten years before the acquisition of Methone, the only city on the west coast of the Thermaic Gulf proper known to have been under Athenian control.⁸² For all the above reasons it is best to consider the location of Othoros as unknown. The absence of the town from the full rubrics of 429/8 (*ATL*, I, 359)—no record is preserved from 433/2 to 430/29—very possibly indicates that it participated in the revolt of the Chalcidic cities, and this may be an indication of the general area within which Othoros is to be sought.

⁸¹ The nominative plural masculine form of the ethnic strongly suggests that Pliny's source is one of the early imperial official surveys. For Pliny's methods see A. H. M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (Oxford, 1937), Appen. I, "Pliny," pp. 491–96, and, particularly as regards the Macedonian area, A. B. West, *Class. Phil.*, XVIII (1923), 59 ff.

⁸² For Herakleion see above, pp. 96–98.

Σερμαῖοι, Σερμῆς, [Σερμαί]ες, Σέρμε

(Pp. 398-99, 546)

Serme appears in the lists for the years 450/49, 448/7, 447/6, [446/5], 445/4, 444/3, [443/2], [442/1], 440/39, 439/8, 435/4, 434/3, 433/2, and 432/1. It is absent from the full panel of 430/29 but appears in the assessment of 421 and can be restored in the list for 429/8.⁸³ Serme, then, was in Athenian hands for a considerable period of time. The editors identify the Serme of the tribute lists with Therme, and from this identification there follows the conclusion that Athens continuously possessed a town on the northern or north-eastern coast of the Thermaic Gulf proper,⁸⁴ that is to say, maintained an enclave in Macedonian territory.

No philological arguments are advanced to support this identification, nor is there any positive evidence to support it.⁸⁵ Θέρμη or Θέρμα is the form of the name which invariably occurs in the literary sources. If the editors' suggestion is to be entertained seriously, we must assume that the Attic chancery in the fifth century employed a form of the town's name quite different and distinct from that used by the authors. But the Thermaic Gulf took its name from Therme,⁸⁶ and in *IG*, I², 302. 68 there is the phrase: ἐν τῷ Θερμαίοι κώπο[ι]. It is indeed unlikely that the chancery would employ an adjective derived from a form of the city's name which was so markedly different from the name of the city used by the chancery it-

⁸³ [Σερμαί]οι instead of [Βερμαί]οι (see above, p. 95 and n. 57).

⁸⁴ Herod. vii. 123. 3 shows that the Thermaic Gulf, properly so called, was thought to begin just north of Ainea. This is probably the meaning of Hecataeus (*FGrH*, Vol. I, No. 1, Frag. 146, p. 26): ἐν δ' αὐτῷ [i.e., κώπο] Θέρμη πόλις Ἑλλήνων ὀρίσκειν, ἐν δὲ Χαλκιδεὶ πόλιν ὀρίσκειν.

⁸⁵ The ἀποδοῦναι of Thuc. ii. 29. 6 definitely implies that Therme had previously been a Macedonian possession.

⁸⁶ Herod. vii. 121. 1: Θέρμη δὲ τῇ ἐν τῷ Θερμαίῳ κώποισι κτλ. ἀπ' ἧς καὶ ὁ κώπος οὗτος τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ἔχει.

self in the tribute lists. Serme and Therme are quite distinct from each other.⁸⁷ The stem of Serme is probably that appearing also in Sermylia.⁸⁸ The location of the town is unknown. Its absence from the full panel of 430/29 may be due to the fact that it had by that year (the list for 431/0 is entirely missing) joined the revolting Chalcidic cities; this is a possible indication for its location.

Though the identification of Serme with Therme must be abandoned, the problem of the latter's location is of some importance. The editors place Therme at Sedhes (now officially "Thermi"), about 7 miles southeast of Salonica,⁸⁹ "whose warm springs no doubt gave the town its ancient name." There is a site of the Hellenic period near Sedhes,⁹⁰ but the hot springs on which the editors rely are not at Sedhes but at Loutra Sedhes, about 3 miles southeast of Sedhes on the road to Vasilika, squarely in the plain, the ancient territory Anthemus.⁹¹ The site northeast of Sedhes is over 2½ miles from the nearest point on the coast,⁹² and Loutra Sedhes

⁸⁷ The equation of Serme and Therme is not accepted by Gomme (*op. cit.*, p. 214).

⁸⁸ Possibly a Thracian root meaning "water" (*RE*, Zweite Reihe, Vol. VI, col. 410).

⁸⁹ D. S. THESSALONIKI, grid O-9433. Distance is measured from the eastern wall of the old city of Salonica (see below, n. 107).

⁹⁰ A. J. B. Wace, "The Mounds of Macedonia," *BSA*, XX (1913-14), 131, C1; see also *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology*, II (1909), 162. This is apparently the site marked "Sermi," just northeast of Sedhes on the British General Staff Map No. 2097, sheet "Mt. Athos," seemingly a learned guess.

⁹¹ D. S. THESSALONIKI, grid O-9929. See A. Struck, *Makedonische Fahrten*, Vol. I: *Chalkidike* (Vienna and Leipzig, 1907), pp. 2-3. The modern town Sedhes (or "Thermi") is Struck's "Tschiftlik Sedes"; Loutra Sedhes is his "Badeort Sedes mitten in der Ebene" (see the map at the end of the volume).

⁹² Alluvial deposits of the Vasilikotikos River cannot have extended the coast to any marked degree since the fifth century. Note the prehistoric tomba called "Gona," "à 500m à l'Ouest de la route entre Salonique et le Grand Karabouroun, à 1 kil. au Sud-Sud-Ouest de l'ancienne Ecole d'Agriculture," discussed by L. Rey, "Sites préhistoriques de la Macédoine," *BCH*, XL (1916), 271-78 and 285. The settlement was one of pile-dwellers on the edge of a marsh.

is over 6 miles inland. Granting that Therme received its name from hot springs, it is very hazardous to place the ancient site solely by means of hot springs which exist today, for marked changes can, of course, have taken place during the last two thousand years. Indeed, there seems to be evidence for hot springs within ancient Thessalonica itself.⁹³

Nor is the following argument, based on Herodotus vii. 121. 1, valid: "Xerxes ordered the fleet and army to separate from Akanthos to Therme, since this gave the shortest march for the army. *Sedes, and not Salonika, is the point where the army would first reach the coast*" (italics mine). I can only interpret this as meaning that the editors conceive the Persian army to have marched, more or less directly, from Acanthus (Ierissós) to Sedhes, a most difficult route along and over the mountains. This is incorrect. Xerxes (Herod. vii. 124), with the Persian land army, left Acanthus and moved through the interior (τὴν μεσό-γαιαν) toward Therme. The route lay through the Paeonian and Crestonian regions toward the Echeidoros (now Gal-

likos) River.⁹⁴ Exactly what Herodotus means by Παιονική is difficult to determine,⁹⁵ but Crestonia was the western slopes of the Krusha Balkan (the ancient Dysoron Oros) north of lakes Bolbe and Langadha (now renamed "Korónia").⁹⁶ The land army under Xerxes' personal command clearly proceeded through the basin of Lake Bolbe, the course of the later Via Egnatia,⁹⁷ westward toward the Echeidoros River. If the army actually reached the river before turning south to the sea, it came to the coast some distance west of Salonica; much more probably, Xerxes took the Derveni Pass, west of Lake Langadha⁹⁸ and so reached the coast almost precisely at the site of Salonica itself. Sedhes is not at all the point "at which the army would first reach the coast." Herodotus' narrative offers no support whatever to the identification of Sedhes as Therme. It is clear from Herodotus that Therme was chosen as a base for the Persian fleet⁹⁹ and the point where Xerxes and the army would reach the coast of the gulf and make contact with the fleet.¹⁰⁰ Therme, therefore, was located directly on the coast, not inland—a conclusion strongly supported by the fact that the gulf took its name from the city.

Strabo (vii, Frag. 21) states that Therme was one of the twenty-six com-

either by a lake or by the sea. This is very evidently the tomba, D. 8, THESSALONIKI, grid O-916314. Note also the tomba at Tsafir across the Vasilikitikos from Gona (cf. BSA, XXIII [1918-19], 26-27). These tombas show that there can have been very little, if any, extension of the coast since early antiquity.

⁹³ Th. L. F. Tafel, *De Thessalonica eiusque agro: dissertatio geographica* (Berlin, 1839), pp. 12-13: "Thermae urbis nomen thermis ipsius debetur. Ejus rei testimonium minime contemnendum extat apud Anonymum Vaticanum, seculi VII scriptorem, in Actis Sanctorum ad VIII. Oct. sive S. Demetrii (Bruxell. 1780) p. 94, cap. 94 [I substitute the later text of Migne, *Patr. Gr.*, CXVI (Paris, 1891), c. 15, col. 1184: δὲ (Leontius) ἀντίκα κατὰ τὰς τῶν καμίνων καμάρους, ἅμα καὶ τοῦ τῶν θερμῶν δόξαν οἴκου καθελὼν καὶ περικαθάρως μετὰ καὶ τῶν ἐκείσε θύων δημοσίων ἐμβόλων καὶ προτυπῶν, ἀνήγειρεν πάνσοπον οἶκον τῷ μάρτυρι, βασιλεῖα κατακοσμήσας χειρῶν πλῆθος τοῦ δημοσίου λουτροῦ καὶ τοῦ σταβίου]. Habuit igitur thermas quasdam, proprie dictas, ipsa urbs Thessalonica, a balneo publico, quo nulla civitas carebat, probe distinguendas" (italics mine). See Tafel's further discussion. Oberhummer (*RE*, Zweite Reihe, Vol. V, col. 2392) is quite wrong in asserting that Tafel (p. 16) distinguishes Therme from Thessalonica. Oberhummer misses the whole point of Tafel's argument.

⁹⁴ Ἐποπέμπο δὲ διὰ τῆς Παιονικῆς καὶ Κρηστωνικῆς ἐπὶ ποταμὸν Ἐχέβορον.

⁹⁵ It is certain, however, that he does not refer to the region north of Macedonia, which was Paeonia *par excellence*. Generally speaking, it is apparent that he is referring to the area extending eastward from the lower Axios to the lower Strymon (cf. Herod. v. 15-16; Thuc. ii. 99. 4).

⁹⁶ Herod. vii. 124 and 127. 2; see also Oberhummer, *RE*, Vol. XI, col. 1718; and Geyer, *RE*, Vol. XIV, col. 655.

⁹⁷ This was the route of the remnant of the Persian army in its retreat after Plataea (Aeschylus *Persae* 492-95).

⁹⁸ D. 8, THESSALONIKI, grid O-9253.

⁹⁹ vii. 121. 1: τὸν ναυτικὸν στρατὸν ἐπομείνει ἐν Θέρμῃ. This is sufficient to rule out Sedhes and Loutra Sedhes.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.* vii. 124; 127. 1.

munities which formed the *synoikismos* of Thessalonica. In another fragment (vii, Frag. 24) he speaks of Thessalonica as ἡ πρότερον Θέρμη ἐκαλεῖτο. It is to be noted that these two statements are not necessarily in conflict; Cassander's new city can have been founded on the site of Therme.¹⁰¹ The editors appear to suggest that the assertion that Therme was the former

¹⁰¹ It is worth pointing out that the cities which contributed to the population of the new foundation did not, or did not all, cease to exist as *poleis*. Strabo (Frag. 21) gives us the names of only six of the twenty-six towns participating in the creation of Thessalonica: Apollonia, Chalastra, Therme, Gareskos, Aineia, and Kissos. Of these Apollonia (Livy xiv. 28. 8; Acts 17:1) and Aineia (see above, p. 88, n. 5; note *urbs*) certainly continued to exist. Chalastra is mentioned elsewhere by Strabo (vii, Frags. 20 and 23), but here it is probable that Strabo is reproducing a pre-Hellenistic source. Gareskos is also mentioned by Strabo (vii, Frag. 36) as apparently east of Lake Doiran, and by Ptolemy (iii. 12. 22) as in Ὀρθηλία, which agrees well enough with Strabo. Neither Gareskos nor Apollonia was near Thessalonica.

Frag. 21 of Strabo is from the Vatican epitome, Frag. 24 from the "Epitome edita." As between the two, there is, I suggest, cogent reason to hold that Frag. 24 reproduces the original text of Strabo more accurately than does Frag. 21. (I am not here discussing the relative merits of the two epitomes but only of these particular fragments.) Note that Frag. 21 has the late spelling Θεσσαλονίκη. Frag. 21 also states that Thessalonica "is the metropolis of present-day Macedonia" (ἡ δὲ μητρόπολις τῆς νῦν Μακεδονίας ἐστίν). In fact, the city did not receive the title of metropolis until the reign of Decius, ca. A.D. 250 (Gaebler, *op. cit.*, 2. Abt., p. 130). But here the word surely means that Thessalonica was the seat of a metropolitan bishopric (see O. Tafrali, *Thessalonique des origines au xiv^e siècle* [Paris, 1919], p. 70; Oberhummer, *RE*, 2. Reihe, Vol. VI, col. 148). It is true that Antipater of Thessalonica in an epigram (*AP* ix. 428) celebrating the victory of L. Calpurnius Piso, proconsul of Macedonia from 13 to 11 B.C., over the Bessi calls Thessalonica the "mother of all Macedonia" (Θεσσαλονίκη μήτηρ, ἡ πάσης . . . Μακεδονίας), but this expression must be dismissed as poetic hyperbole; the silence of the inscriptions, coins, and literary sources, save for Frag. 21 of Strabo here under consideration, is decisive. Note also that Frag. 21 speaks of the cities which contributed to the *synoikismos* as being destroyed (καθελόν), while Frag. 24 mentions, and rightly, only a movement of population (μετάσσειν). It is evident that Frag. 21 shows clear signs of Byzantine contamination and inaccuracy. Such signs are not apparent in Frag. 24. These observations do, I believe, suggest that Frag. 24 is definitely the more trustworthy. It is therefore by no means unlikely that in the latter the phrase ἡ πρότερον Θέρμη ἐκαλεῖτο is an accurate reproduction of Strabo's original text. If such is the case, we have by no means contemptible literary evidence for the equation of Thessalonica with Therme.

name of Thessalonica is an addition by the epitomator.¹⁰² This is possible, but not proved. The scholia to Thucydides (i. 61. 2), whose value is admittedly not high, have ἡ νῦν Θεσσαλονίκη πόλις πάλαι Θέρμη ἐκαλεῖτο.¹⁰³ Malalas (vii. V. 80D [ed. Bonn, p. 190]) has Θεσσαλονίκην, τὴν πρόην λεγομένην κώμην Θέρμας [*sic!*]).¹⁰⁴ Though these late sources are probably independent of one another, it cannot be pretended that their evidence is decisive. One may remark, however, that learned Byzantines may well have been interested in the origins of one of the most important cities of the eastern Empire.¹⁰⁵ The literary sources, such as they are, associate Thessalonica with Therme.

In an important article, K. A. Romaios has recently re-examined the whole question of Therme's location.¹⁰⁶ The archaeological evidence assembled by Romaios gives at least a clear indication as to the area wherein the site of Therme is to be sought. Excavations carried out in 1930 by the University of Salonica on Mikro Karaburnu, the promontory which ex-

¹⁰² So the epitome of Strabo (vii, Frag. 22) has: Πύδνα, ἡ νῦν Κίτρον καλεῖται. The relative clause here is clearly an addition of the Byzantine epitomator. But the statement is correct (Diodorus xiii. 49. 2): ὁ μὲν οὖν Ἀρχίλαος . . . πολιορκήσας τὴν Πύδναν καὶ κρατήσας μετόικισεν αὐτὴν ἀπὸ θαλάττης ὡς εἴκοσι στάδια. The actual distance from Makryialos, the original site of Pydna, to Kitros is slightly over 3 miles, which agrees remarkably well with Diodorus' round figure of 20 stadia. For Pydna see Geyer, *RE*, Vol. XIV, col. 668 and references there cited.

¹⁰³ Cited by Gomme, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

¹⁰⁴ The entries in the *Nomina urbium mutata* (Hierocles *Synecdemus* [ed. Burckhardt], App. I. 55: Ia. 15; III. 106) have no value.

¹⁰⁵ Stephanus under Θεσσαλονίκη has ἦτις ἀρὰ ἐκαλεῖτο Ἀλία. Meineke in his commentary remarks: "Mirum est memorari nomen urbis allunde prorsus non cognitum, reticere autem longe frequentissimum Θέρμα vel Θέρμη. In [Ehldigerano] scriptum est ἀλία i.e. ἈΛΙΑ sive ΜΑ. corrigendum igitur Θέρμα. nimirum hoc quoque factum est quod plurimis locis factum iam vidimus et porro videbimus, ut in libris Stephani primae nominum syllabae exciderint." How long must we wait for a critical text of Stephanus?

¹⁰⁶ K. A. Ρωμαῖος, "Ποῦ ἔκειτο ἡ παλαιὰ Θέρμη," ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΑ, I (1940), 1-7. The sketch map by Makaronas facing p. 6 is particularly valuable.

tends into the Thermaic Gulf about 3 miles (5 km.) south of the old city of Salonica,¹⁰⁷ brought to light significant archaeological finds. The cape was inhabited from the Iron Age (ca. 1000 B.C.) down to at least the fifth and fourth centuries and perhaps throughout antiquity. There were found remains of houses, undatable; graves of the fifth century and perhaps older; sherds of the prehistoric and proto-geometric periods; Rhodian and Chian (so called "Naucratic") and Attic sherds. Among the finds was a remarkable Attic skyphos of about 450 and a large krater and pelike of the period of the Peloponnesian War. These finds were made on the northern part of Mikro Karaburnu toward Salonica. During the first World War an extended necropolis was found on the northeast side of the cape; the most recent graves were of the fourth century.¹⁰⁸ At the so-called "Megali Toumba" in the Kalamaria district just southeast of Salonica, inland from Mikro Karaburnu, Pelikides has found graves of the sixth and fifth centuries; among the finds were Corinthian vases of the early sixth century and Attic black-figure ware.¹⁰⁹ There is also important evidence from within Salonica itself. Two hundred meters west of the Administration Building (Διοικητήριο), between the latter and the Sarapeion,¹¹⁰ have been found many architectural members of the Ionic order, whose style and workmanship, according to Romaïos, recall the Treasury of the Siphnians. Near by was found a small head from an archaic relief, dating from about the turn of the sixth to the fifth centuries. Romaïos holds that the presence of so

¹⁰⁷ By "old city" I mean that portion of Salonica within the Byzantine city walls. Newer quarters of the city extend south along the coast up to the base of Mikro Karaburnu.

¹⁰⁸ See also *BSA*, XXIII (1918-19), 38-39.

¹⁰⁹ See also *JHS*, XLI (1921), 274.

¹¹⁰ For the Sarapeion see *BCH*, XLV (1921), 540-41, and Makaronas, *ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΚΑ*, I (1940), 464-65.

many architectural members in one place indicates that they were not brought from elsewhere for use as building materials. A fragmentary Ionic capital of excellent workmanship (fifth century) has also been found near the University of Salonica. These finds show beyond dispute that a city of the archaic and classical periods existed at or very near Salonica.¹¹¹ This can hardly have been other than Therme.

Romaïos, seeking to harmonize the seemingly contradictory evidence for the site of ancient Therme, suggests that Therme was the collective name for a whole series of villages grouped together in a political union which extended from Salonica down to and including Sedhes.¹¹² But this view is hardly tenable. One may grant that the territory of the city may have been large and have included a number of villages, but there was surely a central fortified point with the temples and public buildings, as was normal for Greek city-states. To the best of my knowledge, nowhere in the northern Aegean area do we have any evidence, so far as Greek cities are concerned, for the peculiar kind of community that Romaïos suggests. All the evidence indicates that Therme, very definitely a *polis* in the ordinary sense of the word,¹¹³ was located at, or very near, Salonica.

¹¹¹ It is hardly necessary to point out the difficulties associated with excavation in a large modern city like Salonica. In the present age it is probably naïve to express the hope that the antiquities and monuments of Salonica may receive something of the care which has been expended on those of Athens. Salonica was one of the great cities of the Byzantine world, and its monuments, if properly displayed and preserved, would in their own sphere attract enormous interest.

¹¹² *Op. cit.*, p. 4: αἰρεται κάθε δυσκολία, ἐὰν δεχθώμεν, ὅτι καὶ οἱ τόποι περὶ τὸν βορειότερον μυχὸν τοῦ κόλπου ὑπῆρχον εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν κοινότητα ἢ πόλιν, τὴν Θέρμην, ἃν καὶ φυσικῶς εἶναι νὰ ὀνομάζοντο μὲ ἓνα ἢ περισσότερα τοπικά ὀνόματα. . . . P. 6: Ἄλλ' ἢ Θέρμη, ὅπως ἀνωτέρω εἶδαμεν, ἀπετελεῖτο ἐκ πολλῶν μικρῶν κομῶν καὶ ἐξετείνετο εἰς μεγάλην ἐκτασιν ἀπὸ τὸ Σῆδες μέχρι τῶν τόπων τῆς κατόπιν Θεσσαλονίκης. . . .

¹¹³ Therme is called a *polis* by Hecataeus (see above, n. 84), Herodotus and [Scylax] 66. Aeschines (ii. 27) seems to refer to Therme as a *χωρίον*, but this

The fact that Therme gave its name to the gulf on the coast of which it was situated probably indicates that it was the most important city on the Thermaic Gulf proper. It is also possible that prominent physical features associated with its site may have caused ancient sailors to name the gulf from the city. Cape Mikro Karaburnu, the only important promontory along the northern coast of the gulf, can have been the cause of the name. It is to be noted that the site of the citadel of Salonica, the Heptapyrgion, is the last high point of land on the coast that one would observe from the sea in antiquity as one sailed from east to west, until passing well beyond the mouth of the Axios.¹¹⁴

Were it not for the fact that Procopius (*De aedif.* iv. 4. 3 [B 279]) gives a Θέρμα in his list of places in Macedonia fortified by Justinian, I should be strongly inclined to locate Therme on the site of Salonica. If Procopius' Therma is the Therme of the archaic and classical periods, then there can be no question that Therme was

quite distinct from Thessalonica, though it was surely in the immediate vicinity of the latter. But there is no certainty of this; Procopius' Therma can have been anywhere in Macedonia.¹¹⁵ Indeed, the fact that Procopius lists Therma among the places fortified by Justinian suggests, rather, that it was *not* in the environs of Thessalonica, for, had it been, its inhabitants could have taken refuge within that city and the emperor would have been spared the expense of superfluous construction.¹¹⁶

This investigation has not succeeded in determining the precise location of ancient Therme. It is clear, however, that there is no longer any cogent reason to place Therme at Sedhes. Therme is to be placed on the coast somewhere in the area running from Mikro Karaburnu to and including the old city of Salonica. Procopius notwithstanding, I regard the old city of Salonica as the most probable site.

Σίνος

(Pp. 406-7, 548-49)

Sinos appears first in the *idiotai* rubric for 434/3 and is restored by the editors for 433/2 (here the payment is preserved). It is absent from the full rubric of 429/8 but reappears again in 421/0, both in the list and in the assessment. In the list of 421/0, Sinos appears with Τριποαί and Καμακαί, both of which are known to have been Bottic cities.¹¹⁷ The land grant of Cassander, appropriately cited by the editors (Ditt., *Syll.*³, 332), states that the

has no weight as against the other evidence. It does, however, indicate that he thought of it as a specific place, not as a group of villages extending over a fairly large area.

¹¹⁴ There is perhaps another indication. Frags. 20 and 23 of Strabo (Book vii) speak of the Axios as flowing into the sea between Chalastra and Therme. Here Strabo is probably reproducing a pre-Hellenistic source (Hecataeus?). The two passages show that Therme is thought of as the first important city on the coast to the east of the mouth of the Axios. The archaeological evidence proves that an important Greek city of the archaic and classical periods did stand on or very near the site of Salonica, and there is every reason to conclude that this is the city to which Strabo's source refers. It is hardly sound method to assume that the ancient city attested by the archaeological finds was not mentioned at all by Strabo (or his source) and that the geographer silently passed on to a city located near Sedhes. Frag. 24 of Strabo begins: *ἐνὶ μετὰ τὸν Ἀξιὸν ποταμὸν ἡ Θεσσαλονίκη ἐστὶ πόλις, ἡ πρότερον Θέρμη ἐκαλεῖτο*. In combination with Frags. 20 and 23, this strongly supports the conclusion that Thessalonica was founded on the site of Therme. We may recall that Frag. 21 (see above, p. 102 and n. 101) says that Therme was one of the towns forming the *synoikismos*. This is, of course, quite true, but, as stated, it is very misleading.

¹¹⁵ There are, for example, hot springs near Langa-dha and at the pass of Rendina.

¹¹⁶ Tafel (*op. cit.*, pp. 14-17) argues very effectively against the identification of Procopius' Therma with Therme.

¹¹⁷ *IG*, I², 90, the treaty between Athens and the Bottiaeans. Tripoai and Kemakal together with Kalindola are listed at the end of the treaty. Enough uninscribed surface is preserved below the text to make it, on the whole, improbable that any other cities save these three were listed as participating in the alliance with Athens.

recipient held τὸν ἀγρὸν τὸν ἐν τῇ Σιναίαι καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ Τραπεζοῦντι (ll. 4-6) and τὸν ἐΣπαρτώλῳι (ll. 15-16). Trapezous seems otherwise unknown, but Spartolos was the chief city of Bottike. The land grant is decisive confirmation for the placing of Sinos in Bottic territory, that is, to the northwest of Potidaea. The stele containing Cassander's grant was found "sur l'emplacement précis de l'ancienne Potidée, à l'entrée de la Pallène."¹¹⁸ The publication of the grant in Cassandreia is readily understandable if the estates were not far distant. Sinos was a Bottic town.

But the editors have unnecessarily complicated the placing of Sinos by suggesting that "it may perhaps be identified with the Σίνδος of Herodotus, VII, 123, 3." Herodotus places Sindos between Therme and the Axios, thus directly on the north coast of the Thermaic Gulf. This region was then Mygdonia (Herod. vii. 123. 3 and 127. 1),¹¹⁹ which was separated from Bottike by Krousis and Anthemus.¹²⁰

Meritt's discovery of a boundary stone reading Βοττικῶς, of the turn from the fifth to the fourth centuries,¹²¹ at Metokhion Zografou, 5 kilometers south of Vromosirtis,¹²² which is a little over 9 miles north-northwest of Potidaea, gives at least a general indication of the southeast frontier of Bottike.¹²³ The site proposed by the editors for Sinos is over 40 miles as a crow flies from Vromosirtis, and it is certain that at no time did Bottic territory ever include the north coast of the Thermaic Gulf. The equation of Sinos with Sindos must be abandoned.¹²⁴ Sinos is to be placed somewhere in the Bottic region of Chalcidice to the northwest of Potidaea.¹²⁵

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

¹²¹ *AJA*, XXVII (1923), 337 ff.; *SEG*, II, 408 (p. 71).

¹²² E. 9, POLIVROS, grid P-1202.

¹²³ See *ATL*, I, 550.

¹²⁴ Had Sinos in fact been located where the editors place it, the publication of Cassander's grant concerning the estate ἐν τῇ Σινάει would have been made in Thessalonica rather than Cassandreia.

¹²⁵ It has not seemed necessary to discuss the location of Strepsa (see Gomme, *op. cit.*, pp. 215-18). Gomme's masterly discussion has shown that the only passage in ancient literature which can be used for the placing of Strepsa is Aeschines ii. 27, and this passage does no more than put Strepsa somewhere in the northwest frontier regions of Chalcidice.

¹¹⁸ Duchesne and Bayet, *Mémoire sur une mission au Mont Athos* (Paris, 1876), p. 71.

¹¹⁹ See also vii. 124, where Herodotus describes the Echeldoros River as flowing through Mygdonia and reaching the sea at the swamp by the Axios.

¹²⁰ For Anthemus see above, p. 91 and n. 28.

HOMER'S DESCRIPTIONS OF SYNCOPE

ALFONS NEHRING

THE present essay was instigated by a study of J. Böhme's work on Homeric psychology.¹ In the chapter dealing with *θυμός*, Böhme pays special attention to Homer's descriptions of syncope. This is justified. These descriptions really throw light on the character of the *θυμός*, though not in the way Böhme assumes. This, however, is a secondary question to be briefly discussed later on. The

point that aroused my interest is Böhme's remark to the effect that the descriptions of syncope lack such stereotyped features as occur in the descriptions of death. Quite the contrary is true. A closer inspection reveals that the descriptions of fainting spells follow clear types and patterns, and this, in turn, helps to eliminate several errors which have become traditional in the interpretation of Homer.

A

To prepare the basis for our typological study we must arrange the relevant material in the following groups:²

GROUP I: SYNCOPE FOLLOWED BY RECOVERY

a) FULL DESCRIPTIONS

1. *Il.* v. 696 ff.: Sarpedon is wounded by a spear, and the weapon is removed by a friend:

τὸν δ' ἔλιπε ψυχὴ, κατὰ δ' ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυτ' ἀχλὺς.
αὐτίς δ' ἀμπνύνθη, περὶ δὲ πνοιῇ Βορέαιο
ζῶγρει ἐπιπνέουσα κακῶς κεκαφηότα θυμόν.

2. *Il.* xiv. 418 ff.: Hector is hit by a stone:

ὥς ἔπεσ' Ἑκτορος ὦκα χαμαὶ μένος ἐν κονίησι.

The Trojans come to his help, and he begins to recover:

436: ὁ δ' ἀμπνύνθη καὶ ἀνέδρακεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν.

But he faints once more:

438: αὐτίς δ' ἐξοπίσω πλήτο χθονί, τῷ δέ οἱ ὄσσε
νύξ ἐκάλυψε μέλαινα· βέλος δ' ἔτι θυμὸν ἐδάμνα.

3. *Il.* xxiii. 466 ff.: Andromache is fainting:

τὴν δὲ κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἐρεβεννὴ νύξ ἐκάλυπεν,
ἦριπε δ' ἐξοπίσω, ἀπὸ δὲ ψυχὴν ἐκάπυσσεν.

The recovery is described in

475: ἡ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀμπνυτο καὶ ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη.

4. *Od.* v. 456 ff.: Odysseus after his shipwreck has come to the shore of Scheria:

a) ὁ δ' ἄρ' ἄπνευστος καὶ ἄνανδος
κεῖτ' ὀλιγηπελέων, κάματος δὲ μιν αἰνὸς ἵκανε.
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἀμπνυτο καὶ ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη,
. . . .

¹ *Die Seele und das Ich im Homerischen Epos* (Leipzig, 1929).

² The passages will be quoted according to their place in the groups, e.g., case I, 1, etc.

Another wave carries him away, until he is saved by Ino. He then reflects about his prospects:

- b) 466: *εἰ μὲν κ' ἐν ποταμῷ δυσκηδέα νύκτα φυλάσσω,
μή μ' ἄμυδις στίβῃ τε κακὴ καὶ θῆλυς ἔερση
ἐξ ὀλιγηπελὴς δαμάσῃ κεκαφρότα θυμόν·
αὔρῃ δ' ἐκ ποταμοῦ ψυχρὴ πνέει ἥωθι πρό.*
470: *εἰ δέ κεν ἐς κλιτὺν ἀναβὰς καὶ δάσκιον ὕλην
θάμνοισι ἐν πυκινούσι καταδράθω, εἴ με μεθείη
ῥίγος καὶ κάματος, γλυκερὸς δέ μοι ὕπνος ἐπέλθοι,
δεῖδω μὴ θήρεσσιν ἔλωρ καὶ κύρμα γένωμαι.*

The last passage (Il. 466 ff.) does not exactly fit into this group, since no recovery is reported. However, this passage represents a special case which must be treated in this group because of its close connection with case 1.

5. *Od.* xxiv. 345 ff.: Upon recognizing Odysseus, Laertes faints:
 τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ λυτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ,

 ἀμφὶ δὲ παιδί φίλῳ βάλε πῆχε· τὸν δὲ ποτὶ οἶ
 εἶλεν ἀποψύχοντα πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς·
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ἄμπνυτο καὶ ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη,

b) ABBREVIATED DESCRIPTIONS

6. *Il.* xi. 355 ff.: Hector is wounded:
*στῇ δὲ γυνὴ ἐριπὼν καὶ ἐρείσατο χειρὶ παχείῃ
 γαίης· ἀμφὶ δὲ ὅσσε κελαινὴ νύξ ἐκάλυπεν.

 τόφρ' Ἔκτωρ ἄμπνυτο. . . .*
 7. *Il.* xv. 9 ff.: Zeus sees Hector, who was badly injured with a stone by Aias:
*Ἔκτορα δ' ἐν πεδίῳ ἴδε κείμενον, ἀμφὶ δ' ἑταῖροι
 εἶαθ'. ὁ δ' ἀργαλέω ἔχετ' ἄσθματι κῆρ ἀπινύσσων,
 αἰμ' ἐμέων. . . .*

Then Apollo finds him:

240: *ἤμενον, οὐδ' ἔτι κέϊτο, νέον δ' ἑσαγείρετο θυμόν.*

Later on Hector describes his sensation at that time:

250 ff: [Aias] ἔπαυσε δὲ θούριδος ἀλκῆς.
*καὶ δὴ ἔγωγ' ἐφάμην νέκυας καὶ δῶμ' Ἀἰδαιο
 ἥματι τῷδ' ἰξεσθαι, ἐπεὶ φίλον αἶον ἦτορ.*

GROUP II: SYNCOPE WITHOUT RECOVERY

a) DEATH FOLLOWS THE SYNCOPE

1. *Il.* xx. 400 ff.: Achilles hits Hippiodamos with a spear:
 403: *αὐτὰρ ὁ θυμόν αἴσθε καὶ ἥρυγεν, ὥς ὅτε ταῦρος
 ἥρυγεν*
 406: *ὥς ἄρα τὸν γ' ἐρυγόντα λίπ' ὁστέα θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ.*
 2. *Il.* xvi. 465 ff.: Sarpedon hits Achilles' horse Pedasos with a spear:
 468: ὁ δ' ἔβραχε θυμόν αἰσθων,
κὰδ' δ' ἔπεσ' ἐν κονίησι μακῶν, ἀπὸ δ' ἔπτατο θυμός.

The following verses describe how Pedasos is freed from the yoke and the other horses go on.

b) NO OUTCOME IS TOLD

3. *Il.* v. 309 f.: Aineias is wounded:

ἔστη γυνὴ ἐριπὼν καὶ ἐρείσατο χεῖρι παχείη
γαίης. ἀμφὶ δὲ ὅσσε κελαυνή νύξ ἐκάλυψε.

He actually recovers.

B

Of the two groups arranged in the preceding section, the first is by far superior quantitatively and qualitatively. Therefore, this group makes it quite clear how much the descriptions of fainting conform to types. To demonstrate these types is the purpose of Table 1.

TABLE 1

Cases	Features				
1....	ἔλιπε ψυχὴ	κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυτ' ἀχλὺς	ἀμπνύνη	πνοιή Βορέας ἐπι- πνείουσα	(ζῶγρει) κακῶς κεκα- φηότα θυμόν
2....		ὅσσε νύξ ἐκάλυψε (cf. Case II, 3) ἀνέδρακεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν	ἀμπνύνη		βέλως δ' ἔτι θυμόν ἐδάμνα
3....	ἀπὸ δὲ ψυχὴν ἐκάπυσσε	κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν . . . νύξ ἐκάλυψε	ἀμπνυτο		ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη
4a....	ἀπνευστος	κάματος ἵκανε	ἀμπνυτο		ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη
4b....				αὔρη ψυχρὴ πνέει	(δαμάσῃ) κεκαφηότα θυμόν
5....	ἀποψύχοντα		ἀμπνυτο		ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη
6....		ὅσσε νύξ ἐκάλυψε	ἀμπνυτο		
7....	ἀργαλέω ἔχετ' ἄσθματι	κῆρ ἀπινύσσων			νέον δ' ἐσαγείρετο θυμόν

This table reveals an almost perfect parallelism in the structure of the descriptions.

1. Night or darkness covers the eyes. The same feature is undoubtedly expressed by *κάματος ἵκανε* in case 4a. In case 2 this symptom is once more mentioned in the description of the recovery: *ἀνέδρακεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν*.

2. The *ψυχὴ* leaves the body (cases 1, 3, 5; on case 4a see below), which is in line with *λ(ε)ιποψυχία* and *λ(ε)ιποψυχεῖν*, the classic terms for "syncope." There can be no doubt that *ψυχὴ* here has its original function as the human breath. This con-

clusion is borne out by the two ways in which the effect of the syncope on respiration is described: In case 7 the normal respiration is impaired: *ἀργαλέω ἔχετ' ἄσθματι*; in the other cases respiration stops, so that the patient is *ἀπνευστος* (case 4a). Hence the recurrence of *ἀμπνύ(ν)η* and *ἀμπνυτο* in the descriptions of the recovery, provided that these words really have the literal meaning "recover breath."³ This,

³ Cf. Sellar (7th ed.), p. 62; Autenrieth-Kaegi (2d ed.), p. 35; Ebeling, p. 120; G. Brune, *Vollständiges Homerisches Vokabular* (Würzburg, 1930), p. 83; *Thesaurus linguae Graecae*, s.v.; Menge, s.v.; P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique* (Paris, 1946), p. 382; cf. also Van Leeuwen, *Ilias* (Leiden, 1912), ad *Il.* v. 696 ff.

however, is a problem that must be discussed.

To begin with, the reading *ἀμ*- adopted in the previous quotations is the only one justified by the textual tradition, although the variant *ἐμ*-, too, which, e.g., is accepted by the Oxford editions of the *Iliad*,⁴ goes back to Greek times. It is based on a correction made by Aristarchus,⁵ as can be learned from Didymus' comment on *Il.* xxii. 475: διὰ τοῦ ἐ' Ἀριστάρχος ἐμπνυτο γράφει, ἐμπνους ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ Σαρπηδόνο (case 1: *Il.* v. 697). Naturally, Aristarchus made the same emendation in all passages concerned, and one may follow either him or the vulgate; but there is no reason for writing *ἐμ*- in some passages, *ἀμ*- in others.

The motive for Aristarchus' correction is obvious. He had noticed that elsewhere the verb *ἀναπνέω* is used when people, panting and puffing because of physical exertion, recover their breath⁶ or, in a metaphoric sense, are relieved from trouble and suffering,⁷ whereas *ἀμπνύ(ν)θη* and *ἐμπνυτο* occur only in connection with syncopes. Aristarchus therefore preferred to write *ἐμπνύ(ν)θη* and *ἐμπνυτο* in the sense of *ἐμπνους ἐγένετο*. W. Schulze⁸ approves of Aristarchus' argument but rejects his emendation. Instead, he separates *ἐμπνυτο*, *ἀμπνύ(ν)θη* from *ἀναπνέω* and derives it from a different root, **πνύ*-, meaning "be in full power of one's intel-

lect," so that *ἀμπνυτο* and *ἀμπνύ(ν)θη* would have to be translated "regain consciousness." To the same root Schulze assigns *πέπνυμαι*, *πεπνυμένος*, and some other words to be discussed later. Schulze's suggestion has not met with general approval. Leaf⁹ considers it as probable. It is also accepted by Boisacq;¹⁰ but Walde and Pokorny¹¹ still consider connection with *ἀναπνέω* as possible; and Schwyzler¹² accepts relationship between *ἐμπνυτο*, *πέπνυμαι*, etc., and *ἀναπνέω* as a fact without further comment. In order to judge about these different opinions, we shall arrange all the instances in four groups (Table 2).

Our analysis of this picture must start from the contrast between groups 1 and 3 in Table 2: *ἀναπνέω* has a strictly physical sense, whereas in the other group the sense is as strictly intellectual. To be sure, Schulze assumes that these latter words originally applied to physical strength and agility and were only secondarily used to denote mental agility as well; but this assumption has no solid foundation. Schulze¹³ feels that *πεπνυμένος*, "sensible, wise," would be out of place as an epithet of young Telemachus, with whom it is particularly often connected,¹⁴ whereas in the sense "vigorous" it would well befit a young man.¹⁵ However, the very name *Τηλέμαχος* does not agree with the young hero. It rather looks like an original epithet of Odysseus that later on became the name of his son. The same possibility could perhaps be considered in the case

⁴ In the 3d ed. for *Il.* v. 697 and xi. 359.

⁵ Cf. J. la Roche, *Die Homerische Textkritik im Altertum* (Leipzig, 1866), p. 190; see also schol. *Il.* v. 697: ἐν τισὶ διὰ τοῦ ἐ' ἐμπνύσθη; schol. *Od.* v. 458: ἐμπνυτο: ἐμπνυτο διὰ τοῦ ἐ'.

⁶ Cf. below, p. 113, on *Il.* xvi. 109 ff.

⁷ E.g., *Il.* xi. 382: οὕτω κεν καὶ Τρώες ἀνέπνευσαν κατόχητος. Likewise ἀνάπνευσis, e.g., *Il.* xi. 801: ἀνάπνευσis πολέμοιο.

⁸ *Quaest. ep.* (Gütersloh, 1892), pp. 319 ff.; likewise Liddell-Scott-Jones, s.v. *ἐμπνυτο*; Van Leeuwen, *Enchiridion dictionis epicae* (Leiden, 1892), Part I, § 186, who, however, thinks that the Greeks themselves may have confused the two verbs. Chantraine (*loc. cit.*) holds the same view. Cunliffe (*Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect* [London, 1924], p. 127) accepts *ἐμ*-.

⁹ *The Iliad* (London, 1900), I, 240.

¹⁰ *Dict. étymol.* (Heidelberg, 1907), p. 769.

¹¹ *Vergl. Wörterbuch*, II, 85.

¹² *Griechische Grammatik* (Munich, 1939), p. 696, n. 2.

¹³ *Op. cit.*, p. 324; cf. also Leaf, *loc. cit.*

¹⁴ Forty-six times, but only seven times with other heroes (cf. F. Sommer, *IF*, LV, 216). On the use of epithets in general see M. Parry, *L'Épithète traditionnelle dans Homère: Essai sur un problème de style homérique* (Paris, 1928).

¹⁵ Schulze refers to *gnava iuventus* in Ovid *Ep. ex Ponto* i. 10. 11 f.; *Trist.* v. 3. 37.

of πεπνυμένος. It would make a fine epithet for Odysseus. But we need not embark upon such historical speculations. For the very reason that wisdom is not a general characteristic of youth, an epithet "wise, prudent" is all the more fit to distinguish an extraordinary young man. Schulze points out that in *Od.* xviii. 230 Telemachus himself confesses

The situation is different in the case of ποιπνύω, "to bustle," which in Schulze's opinion is another evidence of an original meaning "be agile" of the root πνύ-.¹⁶ However, physical exertion causes heavy breathing. It is for good reasons, therefore, that this factor sometimes underlies expressions for heavy work, speed, and so forth; cf. Fr. *un ouvrage de longue haleine*,

TABLE 2

1. Recover Breath, Respite	2. Recovery from Syncope	3. Intellectual Behavior	4. Activity
ἀναπνέω	ἀμπνυτο	πέπνυμαι, "be wise"	ποιπνύω, "bustle"
ἀνάπνευσις	ἀμπνύ(ν)θη	πεπνυμένος	
ἀμπνυε*		πνυτός: ἔμφρων, σώφρων Hesych.	
		Πνυταγόρας, Cyprian name†	
		πινυτός, "intelligent"	
		πινυτή, "intelligence"	
		Dor. πινύτας, "intelligence"	
		πίνυσις: σύνυσις Hesych.	
		πινυμένην: συνετήν Hesych.	
		πινύσσω, "put wise"	
		ἀπινύσσω, "be dulled"	

* *Il.* xxii. 222 (Athene to Hector, who is running and panting): σὸ μὲν νῦν στήθεϊ καὶ ἀμπνυε.

† O. Hoffmann, *Griech. Dial.* (Göttingen, 1891-98), I, 282.

his lack of wisdom: οὐ δύναμαι πεπνυμένα πάντα νοῆσαι. But this argument does not hold water either. The modesty displayed in these words demonstrates the young man's prudence. Moreover, these words are likely to be an allusion to Telemachus' epithet and therefore confirm, rather than contradict, the meaning "wise" of πεπνυμένος. At all events, there is not the slightest evidence that Telemachus' epithet has a meaning different from that of πέπνυμαι in general.

tenir quelqu'un en haleine, like German *jemanden bei Atem halten*, *jem. nicht zu Atem kommen lassen*. In American slang "a breather" and "a winder" are terms for physical exertion.¹⁷ It is obvious, then, that ποιπνύω is an intensive present, the type ποιφύσσω, δαιδάλλω, of the root in πνέω, "breathe," and has nothing to do

¹⁶ Cf. also Boisacq, *op. cit.*, p. 801; Van Leeuwen, *Enchiridium*, p. 350.

¹⁷ Cf. L. V. Berrey and M. van den Bark, *The American Thesaurus of Slang* (New York, 1943), p. 154, and *passim* (see Index).

with *πέπνυμαι* and the other words of the third group.

Schwyzler¹⁸ aligns this group with *πνέω* by referring to Horace's characterization of Lucilius as a man *emunctae naris*.¹⁹ Yet Horace thereby means that Lucilius easily discovered—"smelled," so to speak—the hidden weaknesses of people.²⁰ In the same sense Horace uses *nares acutae*²¹ and, as an opposite, *naris obesa*.²² It is plain, then, that these metaphors have to do, not with breathing, but with smelling. Therefore, these expressions cannot bridge the deep gap between *ἀναπνέω* as a physical activity and the words for intellectual behavior in the third group in Table 2.

On the other hand, this contrast in meaning is paralleled by a formal factor, namely, the surprisingly high percentage of forms with an *-i-* in the third group: *πινυτός*, etc. True, this *-i-* could be a mere anaptyctic vowel;²³ but then it should be expected in the other two groups also. It cannot be by chance that it occurs only and to such an extent in the third group with its essentially different meaning. This fact suggests that *-i-* is an element of the root,²⁴ that is, the same reduced degree of *-ε-* as in *πίτνημι*: *πέτομαι*, *σκίδναμαι*: *σκεδάννυμι*, *πίσσυς*: *τέτταρες*, etc.²⁵

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 278.

¹⁹ *Sat.* I, 4, 8; cf. Phaedrus III, 3, 14.

²⁰ Cf. "to smell a rat."

²¹ *Sat.* I, 3, 29 f.

²² *Epod.* 12, 3. Cf. "have a thick head" in American slang.

²³ Cf. Schwyzler, *op. cit.*, p. 278, who refers to Mod. Gr. *κάπινος*, *πυλίω*, etc.

²⁴ See also M. B. Mendes da Costa, *Index etymol. dictionis Homericae* (Leiden, 1905), p. 231.

²⁵ According to Schulze (*loc. cit.*), the *-i-* in *πινυτός* goes back to *-ε-*, as in *Σικύων* < *Σεκύων*. However, the assumption of such a phonetic change is debated by Brugmann and Thumb, *Griech. Gram.*⁴ (Munich, 1913), p. 340, n. 1. An alternation of *ε* and *ι* occurs in foreign words or in foreign pronunciation of Greek words (cf. Schwyzler, *op. cit.*, p. 181), and the noun underlying *Σεκύων*, namely, *σεκόβα*, *σεκυσ*, *σεκόβα*, "cucumber," is likely to be of foreign origin (cf. Bechtel, *Griech. Dial.* [Berlin, 1924], III, 290; Boisacq, *op. cit.*, p. 864). According to F. Specht (*KZ*, LXI, 277 ff.), both *σεκυ-* and *σεκυ-* are dissimilated from *σεκυν-*, which is very probable.

We should then have to assume a dissyllabic root, **peneu-*, for which an etymology may be suggested. The words *πινυτός*, *πινυμένη*, *νηπίτιος*, etc., have been aligned with OChSl *is-pytъ*, "perscrutatio," *pylati*, "scrutari," on the basis of a root **peu-*: **pu-*, "to investigate, understand, be wise,"²⁶ and a present **πυν-νυμι*. This assumption would imply a dissimilatory change into **πι-νυ-μι* but would still not explain the *-ν-* in *πινυτός*, *πέπνυμαι*, etc., unless we accept Osthoff's suggestion that this *-ν-* is due to analogy with *πνέω*; but this explanation is very doubtful, especially in the face of *πινυτός*.²⁷ All these obstacles can be avoided, if we assume an infix *-ne-*²⁸ and therefore a present stem, **πε-νε-ν-μι*.²⁹ Of course, the zero degree of **πeneu-* should be **πινύ-* or **πνύ-*, with short *-ύ-*; but **πνύ-* is possible, too, since a long vowel is not uncommon in the zero degree of dissyllabic roots in *-eu-*; cf. *ἐρύω*, *ἐρύσσω*: *ρύτός*, *ρύτήρ*; *τέρνυ* *ἀσθενές*, *λεπτόν*: *ἄτρῦτος*, *τέτρῦμαι*. The latter form is perfectly parallel to *πέπνυμαι*.³⁰ However, the etymological origin of this group of words is not our direct concern; but it helps to stress the point in which we are

²⁶ Cf. Osthoff, *Morphologische Untersuchungen* (Leipzig, 1869 ff.), IV, 66 f.; Walde and Pokorny, *op. cit.*, II, 13.

²⁷ Brugmann (*IF*, XIX, 213 f.) explains *πινυτός* as **(ε)πι-νυ-τός*: *νός*, which is not plausible either (cf. Walde and Pokorny, *op. cit.*, II, 13). Even less plausible is Brugmann's earlier explanation (*Grundriss*, II¹, 1012) as *πι-νυ-*: *νήπιος*, *νηπίτιος* (on these words cf. n. 30).

²⁸ See below on *πνέω*. Cf. Skt. *karu-nā*, "holy work": *kṛnomi*, "make, do" < **kṛ-ne-u-mi* and similar cases in Hirt, *Indogerm. Gram.* (Heidelberg, 1921), II, 149 ff.

²⁹ The zero degree **pu-* of the root without the infix could be contained in *νηπίτιος* and *νήπιος* (cf. Walde and Pokorny, *op. cit.*, II, 13), if the latter can be traced back to **νη-πι-ιος*; but *νη* > *π* is doubtful (cf. Schwyzler, *op. cit.*, p. 301; F. Specht, *KZ*, LX, 122 f.), and "with a poor, childish mind" does not seem to have been the original meaning of these words. Another etymology is proffered by Specht, *loc. cit.*

³⁰ Cf. Hirt, *op. cit.*, II, 151; Schwyzler, *op. cit.*, p. 363. Schwyzler assumes a dissyllabic root for *πέπνυμαι*. It is not clear to me how this assumption agrees with his derivation of *πέπνυμαι* from **πε-νε-ν-*.

interested, namely, that these words are obviously different both in meaning and in form from those of the first group, that is, from (ἀνα-)πνέω.

While I thus far basically agree with Schulze, I cannot accept his opinion that ἀμπνυτο, ἀμπνύ(ν)θη must be separated from ἀναπνέω and combined with the words of the third group. From a merely formal point of view the two words in question are linked to ἀναπνέω by ἀμπνυε. The connection between word groups 1 and 2 becomes even clearer from the analysis of πνέω as given by H. Pedersen.³¹ He saw that πνέω contains the same infix -ne- that I considered in the case of πινυτός, etc. Of course, Schwyzler³² finds a root *pneu-, assumed by Pedersen, not very probable; and, in fact, his own suggestion *pu- is more in line with the onomatopoeic character of the verb and is richly attested by words with analogous meanings.³³ In respect to form, *π-νε-ν- splendidly explains πνέω, as well as the zero degree πνυ- in ἀμπνυε. We should also expect *ἀμπνύτο, not ἀμπνύτο; and this involves the further question of whether ἀμπνύνθη of the vulgate should be kept or replaced by ἀμπνύθη.³⁴

To be sure, the -ν- was secondarily inserted in cases like βαρύνθη, ἐκλίνθη, διακρινθείτε, etc.; but there it was taken over from the present, which is out of the question in the case of ἀμπνύνθη. Here the -ν- could result only from analogy with other aorists of the type βαρύνθη.³⁵ Now Meister³⁶ has pointed out that in the case of ἐκλίνθη, etc., the form with -ν- occurs only in Homer, but in no other dialect, so that it is evidently due to metrical length-

ening. This would suggest that ἀμπνύνθη, too, replaced an original ἀμπνύθη. As a matter of fact, some scholia give the form ἀμπνύθη; some, on the other hand, ἀμπνύσθη—no doubt, another analogical replacement of ἀμπνύθη.³⁷ This seems to indicate that ἀμπνύθη still occurred in later Greek times. Naturally, for metrical reasons it must have been ἀμπνύθη; and it may be that later Greek philologists did not recognize the length of the vowel and therefore changed the form into ἀμπνύνθη or ἀμπνύσθη to make it fit the meter. If, then, ἀμπνύθη can be assumed to be the Homeric form,³⁸ the situation is different from that of ἐκλίνθη, etc., and yet it may have the same metrical reason. Since in the case of ἐκλίνθη, etc., the present contained a -ν-, transfer of this -ν- to the aorist was an easy way of getting metrical length; but, since such a present did not exist in the case of *ἀμπνύθη, the poets adopted the normal way of metrical lengthening: they lengthened the vowel. The same would then hold for ἀμπνύτο. There is, of course, a possibility of ū as a weak degree of eu;³⁹ but in a Homeric form metrical lengthening is more plausible. No matter which of the alternatives may appear preferable, the formal connection between ἀμπνύτο, ἀμπνύθη, and ἀναπνέω offers no difficulty.

Nor is there such a difference in the meaning as was felt by Aristarchus and his modern followers. On the contrary, there is a perfect parallelism. Physical exertion impairs our normal respiration: we are "out of breath,"⁴⁰ so we must "recover breath," "get a breathing spell (place, time)."⁴¹ The situation is exactly

³¹ Cf. φέσθην in Galenus beside Attic φέσθη (Schwyzer, *op. cit.*, p. 761, n. 5).

³² Cf. also Schwyzler, *op. cit.*, p. 761, n. 5 (with parallels); Van Leeuwen, *Enchiridium*, p. 418; Chantaine, *op. cit.*, p. 404; Liddell-Scott-Jones, s.v.

³³ Cf. Hirt, *Indogerm. Gramm.*, II, 95, with bibliography.

³⁴ Cf. Ger. *ausser Atem sein*; Fr. *perdre haleine*.

³⁵ Eng. "breather," i.e. "pause for breathing"; Ger. *wieder zu Atem kommen*; Fr. *repandre haleine*.

³¹ *IF*, II, 314.

³² *Op. cit.*, p. 696.

³³ Cf. Walde and Pokorny, II, 79 ff.

³⁴ Cf. Schulze, *op. cit.*, p. 322, n. 1; Van Leeuwen, *Enchiridium*, I, 418; Liddell-Scott-Jones, s.v.

³⁵ Cf. Leaf, *op. cit.*

³⁶ *Die Homerische Kunstsprache* (Leipzig, 1921), p. 36.

the same in the case of a syncope: Our respiration, though for a different reason, is impaired, if not gone, and must be recovered. That the Greeks themselves were aware of this parallelism is evidenced by the following coincidence. Schulze⁴² illustrates his opinion that ἀναπνέω is used only for respite from physical exertion by citing *Il.* xvi. 109 ff. (of Aias in the thick of the battle):

αἰεὶ δ' ἀργαλέω ἔχει' ἄσθματι . . .
 . . . οὐδὲ πη εἶχεν
 ἀμπνέσαι . . .

Now, exactly the same words, ἀργαλέω ἔχει' ἄσθματι, are used in case I, 7 to describe Hector's fainting. To be sure, this description is exceptional. Normally, respiration is said to stop; therefore, Schulze is not right in translating ἀπνευστος⁴³ by "fainted." It is used in the literal meaning, "without breath"; for it is parallel to ἀποψύχω, etc., in the other cases and denotes merely one of the various symptoms of syncope (cf. ἀπνευστος καὶ ἀναυδός in case 4a), the most important of which is the behavior of the θυμός. Since this symptom is mentioned in the second part of the phrase ἀμπνυτο καὶ ἐς φρένα θυμός ἀγέρθη, it is an unavoidable conclusion that the first part refers to the first symptom. That is, ἀμπνυτο and ἀμπνύθη have not the general meaning "come to" or "regain consciousness," but "regain breath." That these two forms occur only in connection with fainting is no counterargument. Since we have to do with an obviously very old stereotyped formula, we cannot be surprised at finding in this old formula the older athematic inflection of πνέω,

⁴² *Op. cit.*

⁴³ Hesiod *Theog.* 797 reads ἀλλὰ τε κείναι ἀνάπνευστος καὶ ἀναυδός. Bechtel, *Lexilogus*, p. 51, like A. Fleck ("Hesiods Gedichte," *Bezenbergers Beitr.*, XII, 75), emends to ἀνάπνευστος and accordingly corrects the verse of the *Iliad*: δ' δ' ἀνάπνευστος καὶ ἀναυδός. The emendation ἀνάπνευστος is not necessary, since ἀνα- can be acknowledged as a negative prefix (cf. Schwyzler, *op. cit.*, pp. 263 and 432). For the rest, the reading of the verse does not concern the meaning.

which, however, also underlies the form ἀμπνυε⁴⁴ in group 1.

After having settled this problem, we can turn to the much more problematic symptom, the behavior of the θυμός.

3. Cases 3 and 4 of Group I above describe this behavior at the time and in the situation of a total recovery: ἐς φρένα θυμός ἀγέρθη. Case 2, on the other hand, describes an only partial recovery, followed by a relapse. Both stages are linked together by the condition referred to by βέλως δ' ἐτι θυμόν ἐδάμνα. This means that here the behavior of the θυμός is depicted as a persisting symptom of the syncope itself. The question then arises: To which of these two types, total or partial recovery, does κεκαφῆóta θυμόν in cases 1 and 4b belong? The answer to this question depends on what this phrase really means.

Here we have an interesting example of how long-lived errors can be. It is a very old tradition to translate κεκαφῆóta θυμόν by "having exhaled the θυμός." Hesychius had already interpreted κεκαφῆóta by ἐκπεπνευκότα.⁴⁵ Liddell and Scott still give the same meaning, "breathing forth one's life." Likewise Boisacq⁴⁶ translates "exhalant" and incidentally accepts W. Schulze's etymology,⁴⁷ suggested upon the basis of such a meaning. That is, Schulze connects κεκαφῆος with the gloss κέκηφε: τέθηκε of Hesychius,⁴⁸ and other philologists added as further cognates κάπνος, "smoke"; κάπνος: πνέυμα Hesych.; κάπος: ψυχή, πνέυμα Hesych.; and the verb ἀποκαπύω in ἀπὸ ψυχῆν ἐκάπυσσε (case 3).

There is, however, another etymology, which was proposed by Bezenberger.⁴⁹

⁴⁴ Cf. *δμνυε*, besides Homeric *δμνυ-θι*; *εἰός*, besides *κλύ-θι*.

⁴⁵ Cf. also *Etymologicum magnum*, s.v.: . . . ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκπεπνευκότα, Eust., etc. (see Ebeling, *op. cit.*, s.v.).

⁴⁶ *Op. cit.*, s.v.

⁴⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 249.

⁴⁸ It occurs also in scholia.

⁴⁹ *Bezenbergers Beitr.*, V, 313.

He considered *κεκαφήως* and *κέκηφε* as kindred to *κωφός*, "powerless, blunt," and (with respect to the mind or the senses) "dumb, mute." The application of such a term to the *θυμός* would have a parallel in Lat. *hebes*, *hebesco*, which likewise apply to physical as well as to psychical and intellectual "bluntness" or "dulness." So does Ger. *stumpf*, "blunt, dull," in *stumpfsinnig*, "with a dull mind." On the other hand, German uses *abgestorben*, "dead," for limbs which have become numbed or have lost sensibility. This would explain a reverse development, "blunt, dull," to "lacking sensibility," to "dead" in *κέκηφε τέθνηκε*. Finally, Bezzenberger's interpretation would fit *κεκαφήότα θυμόν* inasmuch as *θυμός* is, no doubt, something like energy, a motive power, which, of course, can be dulled, that is, numbed or weakened. Bezzenberger has met with little approval;⁵⁰ his etymology has not been able to compete with the traditional interpretation, and yet it is far superior from the linguistic point of view, as well as for the meaning of the passages containing the phrase *κεκαφήότα θυμόν*.

If this phrase really meant "exhale *θυμός*," it would seem to support the old hypothesis that *θυμός*, like *ψυχή*, was originally the human breath. Böhme is willing to accept this hypothesis, for which he thinks he finds support in the allegedly similar phrase *ἀπὸ δὲ ψυχῆν ἐκάπυσσε* in *Il.* xxiii. 467 (case I, 3). It is, however, not true that this is a close parallel to *κεκαφήότα θυμόν*. For one thing, it is certainly not by chance that in *Il.* xxiii. 467, where really "breath" and "exhaling of breath" are meant, the *ψυχή* is referred to, not the *θυμός*. On the other hand, a compound *ἀποκαπίσσω* is used, which is particularly important, as it throws light on the meaning of *κεκαφήως*. If this word, too, had the

meaning "exhale," we would, of necessity, expect an expression for the essential element *ex* as we find it in *ἀπο-καπίω* and other words denoting the end of vital functions, e.g., *ἀποφύχω*, *ἐκπνέω*; *animam* or *vitam efflare*, *animam e-dere* or *e-bullire*; Ger. *die Seele aus-hauchen*, *den Geist auf-geben*; Fr. *ex-haler son âme*; Eng. *ex-hale one's life*, *breathe out one's life*, *give up the ghost* (cf. also *Il.* v. 696: *ἔλιπε ψυχῆ*; xvi. 856: *ψυχῆ δ' ἐκ . . . πταμένη*). Particularly instructive is the fact that such expressions in Homer occur also in the case of *θυμός*, when a real cessation, a real "departure" of this function in the moment of death, is meant, e.g., *Il.* iv. 524 and xiii. 654 (cf. below, p. 120): *θυμόν ἀπο-πνείων*; *Il.* xvi. 540: *θυμόν ἀποφθινίθουσι*; *Od.* xv. 354: *θυμόν ἀπὸ μελέων φθίσθαι*; *Il.* vii. 131: *θυμόν ἀπὸ μελέων δύναι*; *Il.* vi. 17, and elsewhere (8 times): *θυμόν ἀπ-ήύρα*; *Il.* v. 346, and elsewhere (20 times): *θυμόν ἐξαιρείσθαι* or *ἀφαιρείσθαι*; *Il.* xvii. 616: *ᾤλεσε θυμόν*; *Il.* viii. 90, and elsewhere: *ἀπὸ θυμόν ὄλεσεν*; *Od.* x. 163, and elsewhere: *ἀπὸ δ' ἔπτατο θυμός*; *Il.* iv. 470, and elsewhere: *λίπε θυμός*; *Il.* xiii. 671 f., xvi. 606 f.: *θυμός ῥχετ' ἀπὸ μελέων*.

If we consider the number of such analogous cases, the lack of *ἐκ-* or *ἀπο-* or similar expressions in *κεκαφήότα θυμόν* must appear to be of paramount importance. It is, therefore, very strange indeed that the large majority of modern philologists have overlooked this difficulty, although it was already noticed by Eustathius (559. 29). In case I, 1, his explanation is: *κεκαφήότα τὸν ἀπλῶς πνεύσαντα, κακῶς δὲ κεκαφήότα τὸν δυσπνοήσαντα ὡς μικροῦ καὶ ἐκπνεύσαι*. This explanation is, of course, wrong; *κακῶς* beyond doubt has only the meaning "very, much" as Eng. "badly" in phrases like "he is badly mistaken." As a matter of fact, it also occurs with this meaning in the Homeric phrase *κακῶς ὑπερηνόροντα* "badly [= 'very'] arrogant." Notwithstanding

⁵⁰ See Autenrieth-Kaegi, s.v.; Bechtel, *Lexilogus*, p. 191.

this error, Eustathius had a clear understanding of the decisive grammatical obstacle to the translation of *κεκαφῆντα* by "exhale." The same obstacle was pointed out by Faesi in his commentary,⁵¹ who therefore suggests the translation "panting" (with *θυμόν* as an accusative of limitation). The same meaning was assumed by Monro.⁵² Its impossibility will be discussed later.⁵³ For the moment it is sufficient to emphasize that the structure of the form *κεκαφῆς* excludes the meaning "exhale."

The same result is arrived at by other considerations. If *κεκαφῆντα θυμόν* really meant "having exhaled the *θυμός*," it would appear very strange that in case I, 1 this symptom of the incipient syncope is placed at the end of the entire description, after the recovery had already begun (*ἀμπνίθη* . . .). Böhme tries to eliminate this obvious difficulty by assuming that the poet describes the beginning of the syncope by looking back at it from the end. This is not convincing in itself; moreover, it is flatly contradicted not only by the structure of the description but also by a linguistic fact. If we accept Böhme's opinion, we should have to translate *κεκαφῆς* as a historical tense, that is, "he who [before] had exhaled"; but there is no historical perfect in Homeric Greek. Homer's active perfect can express past action only in the way of a *perfectum resultativum*, that is, it can denote only such past action as results in a present status and only if the past action has an aftereffect on the subject,⁵⁴ e.g., *τέθνηκε*, "he died and is now dead." Since this involves the end of the past action, the resultative perfect normally oc-

curs only with perfective verbs, which like "to die," "to bring," "to come," denote actions bound to come to an end. Now, since we saw that *κεκαφῆντα*, even if it were related to *καπῶω*, could not have the perfective sense "exhale," but only a durative sense, such as "to breathe," *κεκαφῆντα* can hardly be a resultative perfect either.

Then there remains only the third possibility, which Monro, too, assumes, namely, that *κεκαφῆς* is a present perfect of the type *γέγηθε*, "is glad," *κεχαρῆς*, "rejoicing," etc. Therefore, *κεκαφῆντα θυμόν* must denote a continuing status, notably that of the syncope. This is why Monro and Faesi translate "panting";⁵⁵ but this cannot be correct. Since panting is a matter of breath and respiration, it cannot apply to the *θυμός*, that is, an "energy." Its behavior is strictly distinguished from that of respiration in all our descriptions, as can be learned from a glance at Table 1. To be sure, Eng. *pant*, in the sense of "throb" or "pulsate," can also be said of the heart and the blood; but it then denotes heavy and intensified activity, whereas our descriptions, as a whole, leave no doubt that the activity of the *θυμός* during the syncope is restricted and weakened. The result is that Bezzenberger's translation of *κεκαφῆς* by "being weak, numbed," is the only interpretation which does justice to the sense of the entire description, as well as to the grammatical value of *κεκαφῆντα* as an intensive *perfectum praesens* of the type *γέγηθε*.

Moreover, how does the phrase *κεκαφῆντα θυμόν* fit into the syntactical structure of the sentences in which it occurs? Those who understand the verb from which *κεκαφῆς* comes in the traditional sense of "exhale" must consider *θυμόν* as the object of *κεκαφῆντα* and the latter as a reference to the fainting person. Faesi,⁵⁶

⁵¹ *Homers Iliade*, ed. F. R. Franke (7th ed.; Berlin, 1888), ad loc.

⁵² *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect* (2d ed.; Oxford, 1891), p. 31.

⁵³ See below.

⁵⁴ Cf. J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, I (Basel, 1920), 168 (with biblog.); Schwyzer, *op. cit.*, p. 768.

⁵⁵ See above.

⁵⁶ See above.

however, understands *θυμόν* as an accusative of limitation, which in itself is possible. As a matter of fact, such an accusative is quite common for psychical phenomena; cf. *Il.* xv. 627: *τρομέουσι δέ τε φρένα ναῦται*; iv. 272: *γηθόσυνος κῆρ*; viii. 437: *φίλον τετιημέναι ἦτορ*; *H. Apoll.* 256: *κραδίην ἐχολώσατο*; likewise *θυμόν* *χολοῦσθαι*, *χώεσθαι*, *ἀχέειν*. Therefore, we could very well translate *κεκαφηότα θυμόν* by "weak in the *θυμός*." There is, however, still another possibility, viz., that *κεκαφηότα* could be an appositive to *θυμόν*. To be sure, we would then have two different objects in case I, 4b: *μή με στίβη . . . δαμάσῃ κεκαφηότα θυμόν*; but this is possible; it could be the type *ποιόν σε ἔπος φύγεν ἕρκος ὀδόντων*.

It is very interesting indeed that of these three possibilities the last one, and only the last one, is attested in late Greek poetry: Opp. *Cyn.* iv. 206: *κεκαφηότα γυνῖα*; Nonn. *Dion.* ii. 539: *κεκαφηότα γυνῖα κεραυνῶ*. Particularly instructive is Opp. *Hal.* iii. 572: *κεκαφηότι θυμῶ*, as this is strictly parallel to Homer's *κεκαφηότα θυμόν*. It therefore is quite important that in this case, as well as in all other late Greek instances, *κεκαφηώς* has the precise meaning which I am trying to prove is the only possible one. Even Liddell and Scott, though they cling to the meaning "exhale" as far as Homer is concerned, admit that in later poetry *κεκαφηώς* is an intransitive form with the meaning "worn out, fordone." Now, if we consider that this verb occurs earlier only in Homer and only in the phrase *κεκαφηότα θυμόν*, it is plain beyond doubt that these late poets here, as so often, were under the influence of Homer. At least we thus learn how they understood the Homeric phrase, and this is an argument not to be underrated. Of course, late Greek interpreters of Homer sometimes blundered, but in this case these poets saw quite correctly what later

generations of philologists failed to realize, for the reason that they did not notice the stereotyped structure of the descriptions listed in our Group I. They therefore missed the lead offered by the parallelism of these descriptions.

In all, the *θυμός* is mentioned at the end, that is, in connection with the recovery. There is, however, the difference already mentioned: In some cases the recovery is total, in some only partial.⁵⁷

The first type is clearly characterized by the phrases *ἐς φρένα θυμός ἀγέρθη* and *νέον δ' ἐσαγείρετο θυμόν*, which means that the *θυμός* resumes its function, together with the revival of the respiration (*ἀμπνυτο*, *ἀμπνύθη*). The way this fact is expressed in the above phrases is, incidentally, another bit of evidence against the assumption that the fainting person was believed to "exhale" his *θυμός*. "To gather" (*ἀγείρω*) can properly be said only of something that has been dissipated.⁵⁸ This involves a weakening, whereas a gathering, that is, a concentration, implies a strengthening of the *θυμός*.⁵⁹ However, one cannot strengthen something that has been exhaled and therefore is gone. The correctness of this conclusion from the expressions *θυμός ἀγέρθη*, *θυμόν ἀγείρετο* is corroborated by *Od.* vii. 283 ff., where Odysseus tells Alcinoüs of the storm that wrecked his ship and threw him to the shore:

ἐκ δ' ἔπεσον θυμηγερέων, ἐπὶ δ' ἀμβροσίῃ νύξ ἤλυθ'. ἐγὼ δ' ἀπάνευθε διπτεῖος ποταμοῖο ἐκβάς. . . .

The compound *θυμηγερέω* obviously means the same as *θυμόν ἀγείρειν*: Odysseus had to gather new strength. Nothing, however, is said of a syncope, so that in this case an exhaling, that is, a departure, of the *θυμός* is entirely out of the question.

⁵⁷ See above, p. 113.

⁵⁸ Cf. the opposite English terms: "to dissipate one's energy"—"to gather strength."

⁵⁹ Cf. Ger. *geballte Kraft*.

The *θυμός* was only weakened and therefore had to be reconcentrated. It is logical to assume that the use of the above analogous phrases in the descriptions of a syncope presupposes the same situation.

An identical conclusion is suggested by the phrase *βέλος δ' ἔτι θυμὸν ἐδάμνα* in case I, 2a. It can only mean that during the syncope the *θυμός* had been overpowered and paralyzed, as is indicated by such parallels as *Il. x. 2: δεδμημένοι ὕπνω*; xiv. 353: *ὑπνῶ καὶ φιλότῃσι δαμείς*; i. 61: *πόλεμος τε δαμῆ καὶ λοιμός Ἀχαιοῖς*; *Od. xiv. 318: αἴθρῳ καὶ καμάτῳ δεδμημένον*. However, one cannot paralyze or overpower something that has gone. So the *θυμός* cannot have been exhaled, but only weakened, and this status is still (*ἔτι*!) continuing even at the moment that the respiration has come back. This means that we have to do with only a partial recovery, whereas in the cases containing the phrases *ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη* and *νέον θυμὸν ἀγείρετο* the recovery is total, that is, both respiration and *θυμός* resume their full functions. At all events, it is now clear why the *θυμός* is always mentioned in connection with the recovery, and therefore at the end of the entire description. It is obvious, then, that *κεκαφήτο θυμὸν*, too, in case I, 1, since it appears in the same place, must refer to the recovery: the *θυμός* is still weak, although the patient is again breathing.

The continued weakness of the *θυμός* in this case has a special reason, which is clearly stated but has not yet been noticed; for this passage has been totally misunderstood by the interpreters, because they have not seen the parallelism between this and the other passage containing the phrase *κεκαφήτο θυμὸν* (case I, 4b). This parallelism must now be studied.

In the latter passage Odysseus tells how, after having been thrown ashore on

Scheria, he had to solve the problem of where to spend the night. He had the choice between two possibilities. He could stay on the bank of the river to which he had been swept by the surf, or he could climb up a hill and hide in the thick woods. In both cases he had to face the danger of death. This is clearly stated for the second alternative: He may fall asleep and then be killed by wild beasts. It is evident that death as the ultimate outcome is meant also by *μή μ' ἄμυδις στίβη τε . . . καὶ . . . ἔερση . . . δαμάσῃ* in the other alternative; for the descriptions of the two possibilities are strictly parallel. The only difference is that they proceed in opposite directions. While in the second case the narration leads up from the beginning to the end, in the first case it goes the opposite way. This means that every step forward in the description mentions the cause for the preceding step: Dew and frost will kill me. Why? Because I shall faint, and the *θυμός* will be weakened. Why? *Ἀῦρη δ' ἐκ ποταμοῦ ψυχρὴ πνέει ἡῶθι πρό*. There are good reasons for mentioning the time (*ἡῶθι πρό*); for, if Odysseus stays close to the river, he must remain awake (*νύκτα φυλάσσειν*), since in this case he would not have the protection from possible attacks by natives which the woods would give him in the other case. But when dawn comes, the icy morning breeze might numb him into a fainting spell, and then he might be killed by the frost.

That the cold breeze really is meant to be the cause of the anticipated syncope is proved by the parallelism with case I, 1:

. . . . *περὶ δὲ πνοιῇ βορέαο
ζώγρει ἐπιπνέουσα κακῶς κεκαφήτο θυμὸν.*

It cannot be by mere chance that the only two instances of *κεκαφήτο θυμὸν* also contain a reference to the cold wind. There must be a connection and therefore a parallelism

in the meaning. But is the wind in case I, 1 really a cause of the weakness of the *θυμός*? This question is connected with the problem of the meaning of the word *ζώγρει*.

This verb, as a compound of *ζωός* and *ἀγρέω*,⁶⁰ normally means "to catch (alive)" which, however, does not fit our passage, unless one were willing to accept Bechtel's obviously impossible interpretation: Boreas catches the numbed *θυμός* alive and refreshes it.⁶¹ Eustathius, therefore, assumed for our passage another verb with another meaning,⁶² and it became an extraordinary success. Later Greek authors used the verb in the sense suggested by Eustathius,⁶³ and up to the present time dictionaries and commentaries⁶⁴ follow him in deriving this verb *ζωγρεῖν* from *ζωή* and *ἀγείρω* or *ἐγείρω* and translating it, accordingly, by "awake, vivify, revive": The patient has begun to breathe, and Boreas (definitely) revives him. Now the assumption of an exceptional meaning for only one passage is always awkward and can be justified only in case of a real emergency. But there is no such emergency, if we correctly understand the passage in question. It does not mean that Boreas finishes the recovery; on the contrary, he prevents it in the same way as does the spear in case 2: *βέλος δ' ἔτι θυμὸν ἐδάμνα*. These two cases are strictly parallel inasmuch as both tell of only a partial recovery. In both, the person who fainted has resumed breathing, but the *θυμός* is still checked, by the spear in case 2, by

the cold Boreas in case 1. In other words, *ζωγρεῖν* has here, as in all other instances, the meaning "catch" or "keep, after having caught," respectively. This interpretation definitely shows the parallelism with case 4b, which, as said before, must be expected because of the detail of the cold wind in connection with the phrase *κεκαφῆστα θυμὸν*. We now realize that in both cases the wind actually has an influence on the syncope. The only difference is that in case 4b the wind causes the attack, while in case 1 it prolongs the fainting spell.

So all details fall into place, and we can now sum up. From whatever angle we study the meaning of *κεκαφῆστα θυμὸν*, we always come to the same result: It cannot mean "having exhaled the *θυμός*" but only "the numbed *θυμός*."

C

The result of the preceding section prepares us for a better understanding of the descriptions gathered in Group II, a. These cases are characterized by the use of the phrase *θυμὸν ἀτθεῖν*, which, in turn, is linked to *ἄϊον ἦτορ* in case I, 7 (ll. 250 ff.). The two verbs have always—and rightly—been considered as kindred. Regarding their meaning, however, we come across another seemingly immortal error. Ever since the days of the Greeks, dictionaries down to Liddell-Scott-Jones and grammarians down to E. Schwyzer have derived these verbs from the roots contained in Gr. *ἄφηνι*, "blow"; Skt. *vāti*; Av. *vā'ti*; Lat. *ventus*; etc. They therefore translated the phrase *θυμὸν ἀτθεῖν* by "exhale the *θυμός*," and *ἄϊον ἦτορ* in an analogous way.⁶⁵ Nevertheless, this translation is grammatically doubtful and is strictly

⁶⁰ On the exact character of the composition see W. Stolz, *Wiener Studien*, XXV, 218 ff.

⁶¹ *Lexilogus*, p. 148.

⁶² E.g. (p. 623): *ζῶν ἀγείρειν καὶ τὴν λειποθυμίαν ἐπανακαλεῖσθαι*; cf. *Thesaurus*, s.v.

⁶³ The instances are listed in the *Thesaurus* and in Liddell-Scott-Jones, s.v.

⁶⁴ Liddell-Scott-Jones: "restore to strength and life"; Menge, s.v.; Stolz, *loc. cit.*; Van Leeuwen, *Iliad*, p. 698; *Thesaurus*, s.v.; Autenrieth-Kaegi², s.v.; Mendes da Costa, *op. cit.*, p. 79; Ebeling, s.v.; Pape, s.v.

⁶⁵ Cf. schol. *Od.* xv. 252; Boisacq, *op. cit.*, p. 29; P. Persson, *Beiträge zur indogerm. Wortforschung* (Uppsala, 1912), pp. 12, 476, n. 3; H. Hirt, *Handbuch der griech. Laut- und Formenlehre* (2d ed.; Heidelberg, 1912), p. 503; Brugmann and Thumb, *op. cit.*, p. 345; Schwyzer, *op. cit.*, p. 703.

contradicted from a semantic point of view, as well as by the context.

To be sure, a derivation from the base **ayē-*, "blow," could explain the initial *ā-* of *ἄϊον*, since, at least in Ionic, contraction of *a* and *η* results in *ā* (cf. *δράητε* > *δρᾶτε*); but in a present tense **ἄφη-ω* the *-i-* should have disappeared, so that we would expect **ἄον* rather than *ἄϊον*. The situation would be different if we started from a diphthongal base **ayēi-*, as assumed by Solmsen.⁶⁶ The zero degree would be **ayī-*, and the present tense derived from this form, that is, **afī-ω*, could have become **āīω* and, with quantitative metathesis, *āīω*. Yet the assumption of a base **ayēi-* is debated.⁶⁷ It is based chiefly on Goth. *waian* (< *wējan*); OHG *wajan*; OChSl *vějati*, "blow"; but these can as well be *īō*-presents of **ayē-*. No matter which way we interpret them, they contain the full degree of the base with *-ē-*; so do Gr. *ἄφημι*, Skt. *vāti*, Av. *vā'ti*. This makes it doubtful whether we are entitled to assume a present tense with the zero degree **ayai-* > **ayī-*; and such an assumption, as said before, would appear necessary to explain the *-i-* of *ἄϊον*. There is, however, another possibility of explaining this *-i-*, which is suggested by the form *ἄισθω*. Its *-σ-* would be inorganic, if we have to do with a derivation from **ayēi-*; we should rather expect **ἄfiθω*. This, of course, is no decisive argument, since *-θω* may alternate with *-σθω*. On the other hand, if the *-σ-* belongs to the root, the preservation of the *-i-* in *ἄϊον* would be explained. Such a root was assumed by Bechtel,⁶⁸ who connected our verbs with IE **yei-* or, with formans *-s-*, **yeis-*: **yis-* in ON *visinn*, "withered, flabby";

visna, "wither"; MHG *wesel*, "weak, tired, numb"; Swed. *vesa*, "get tired." In fact, a present **ἄφισθω* immediately explains *ἄισθω*. No less easy is the assumption of a present-tense form **a-yis-īō* > *āiω* > *āīω* > *āīω* with *metathesis quantitatū* as, e.g., in **Ἀχαϊκος* > **Ἀχαικος* > **Ἀχᾶκος*.⁶⁹ The long *ā-* of *ἄϊον*, then, would have to be understood as an Aeolism, which offers no difficulty. The phrase *ἄϊον ἦτορ* looks very old anyway. The form may possibly have been preserved because of a confusion with *ἄϊον*, "I heard." Such a mistake occurred in ancient and modern times.⁷⁰ There is a slight difficulty, inasmuch as the initial *a-*, which has to be assumed for *ἄισθω* and *ἄϊον*, does not seem to occur in any of the other words grouped together with the two Greek verbs by Bechtel's etymology. It can, however, be a mere and specifically Greek prothetic vowel before the initial *y-* as, e.g., in *ἔεργη*, Cret. *ἄεργη*: IE **yers-*. It may be mentioned that, even in the case of *ἄφημι*, Solmsen⁷¹ has considered the *a-* as a prothetic vowel rather than as the first part of a dissyllabic base. This initial *a-*, therefore, is no obstacle to Bechtel's etymology, which, on the other hand, is much superior to the derivation from **ayēi-* or **ayē-* not only so far as the form is concerned but also in the meaning which it implies, namely, "to become or to be weak, numbed, dull." This agrees with the meaning demonstrated for *κεκαφῆντα*, whereas, on the other hand, the time-honored interpretation "exhale" meets with the same difficulties as in the case of

⁶⁶ Cf. Schwyzler, *op. cit.*, pp. 265 f.

⁷⁰ Hesychius had interpreted *ἄϊον* (*ἦτορ*) by *ἡκον* and *ἡσανόμην*, as he had interpreted *ἄισθω* by *ἐν αἰσθήσει ἔχω*. Likewise, G. C. Crusius, H. Smith, and T. K. Arnold, *A Complete Greek and English Lexicon* (London, 1886), s.v. *ἄϊον*: "I felt my heart (viz., the pulsation)." Others: "I knew it in my mind." Prellwitz, *Etym. Wörterbuch* (2d ed.; Göttingen, 1905), p. 18: "I perceived my heart" > "I felt a deadly pain."

⁷¹ *Op. cit.*

⁶⁶ *Untersuchungen zur griech. Laut- und Versteher* (Strassburg, 1901), pp. 270 ff.

⁶⁷ See Persson, *op. cit.*; Walde and Pokorny, I, 270 ff.

⁶⁸ *Lexilogus*, pp. 21 ff.; Walde and Pokorny (I, 221) are doubtful.

κεκαφηώς, namely, the lack of a prefix expressing the essential concept "ex." Consequently, *ἀίσθω* and *ἄϊον* could at best only mean "breathe," not "exhale."

It is equally important that the latter meaning does not fit into the context of the Homeric passages. Cases II, 1 and 2 are parallel not only in the occurrence of the phrase *θυμὸν ἀίσθειν* but also in so far as this phrase is followed by another phrase mentioning the *θυμός*. Now, in case II, 1, these two phrases are separated by the comparison with the bull but are connected by the mention of the *ἐρείγειν*. Therefore we could perhaps assume a paraphrasing repetition of line 403. Yet, if we adopt the traditional interpretation of *ἀίσθειν* in case II, 2, we are forced to translate: "[The horse] exhaled the *θυμός*, fell down, and the *θυμός* left." This would be a tautology of the worst kind, which can easily be eliminated, if we consider the entire structure of the description in this case as well as in case II, 1.

Böhme (in opposition to Bickel) assumes that these two passages are descriptions not of syncopes but of death. He must, however, admit that they bear a close resemblance to the descriptions of fainting, inasmuch as they depict a *slow* dying as a condition like that of a syncope. This is only half-correct. The full truth is arrived at if we compare the other passages in which the *θυμός* is mentioned in real descriptions of death, namely,

II. iv. 522 ff.:

... ὁ δ' ὕπτιος ἐν κονίῃσιν
κάππεσε, ἄμφω χεῖρε φίλοις ἐταροῖσι πετάσσας
θυμὸν ἀποπνέων ...

II. xiii. 653 f.:

ἐξόμενος δὲ κατ' αἶθρι φίλων ἐν χερσὶν ἐταίρων
θυμὸν ἀποπνέων. ...

It is obvious that in these two passages *θυμὸν ἀποπνέων* really means the departure (*ἀπο-*) of the *θυμός* and therefore the death of the person. The same is undoubtedly

meant by *λίπ' ὅστέα θυμός* and *ἀπὸ δ' ἔπτατο θυμός* in our cases II, 1 and 2. Then the first phrase *θυμὸν ἀίσθειν* in these cases must, of necessity, mean something that precedes the death, the definite departure of the *θυμός*.⁷² This can only be a state of weakness, dulness, possibly unconsciousness. In other words, these descriptions of slow death split the whole process up into two successive phases. The first is a state like that in the case of fainting, the second is the departure of the *θυμός* from the body. Consequently, *θυμὸν ἀίσθειν* must have the meaning "to become numbed," as assumed by Bechtel. This translation not only overcomes the insurmountable difficulty which the translation "exhale" meets in the lack of a prefix *ἐκ-* or *ἀπο-*; it also eliminates the tautology in case 2 which has been pointed out before. Instead, we observe a logical progress of the description: The horse becomes numb, falls down, and finally the *θυμός* leaves. Even in case 1 this interpretation makes a better sense:

Phase 1: Hippodamus becomes weak and starts screaming.

Phase 2: While he is still screaming, the (already weak) *θυμός* departs.

Likewise case I, 7, offers a certain difficulty, if we accept the meaning "exhale" for *ἄϊον* ...; for it would be strange to say "I exhaled my heart." Even if *ἦτορ* were meant in the wider sense of "soul," an exhaling of the soul, as is shown by *θυμὸν ἀποπνέειν*, would mean "to die," and Hector could not very well say that he was dying, since he remained alive. He could only speak of a sensation that gave him the impression of dying, and such a sensation would indeed be expressed, if we translate "because I became weak in my heart."

This interpretation is corroborated by

⁷² This was rightly pointed out by Ebeling (*op. cit.*, p. 56) but did not impress the interpreters of Homer.

the way in which the accident is described by Homer in line 10: ἀργαλέω ἔχετ' ἄσθματι κῆρ ἀπινύσσων. . . . Since this verb is akin to πινυτός and πινύσσειν, "put wise," it can only mean "have no intellectual power." In fact, in *Od.* v. 342 and vi. 258 it means "to be foolish." Consequently, κῆρ ἀπινύσσειν must be translated by "without sensibility in the soul" or something like this. However, κῆρ connects this phrase with ἦτορ αἰών in Hector's later report, which therefore must have an analogous syntactical structure and meaning.

All this, I think, makes it definitely clear that αἰσθεῖν and αἰεῖν can only mean "be numbed, dull," and consequently are parallel to κεκαφήως.

D

The present study is another piece of evidence both of the role which types of description play in the technique of the Homerids and of the help these types offer to the interpretation of Homer and the Homeric language. The erroneous translations of the expressions discussed on the previous pages could be so long-

lived only because interpreters and linguists failed to realize the parallelism and structural patterns of the descriptions in which the terms concerned occur. Once these patterns have been recognized, the correct meaning of the words and phrases involved immediately becomes manifest.

It also becomes definitely clear that the θυμός was never anything else than a bodily energy, as was demonstrated by Böhme, or, as Snell⁷³ puts it, an *Organ der Regung*, that is, a principle of motion and impulse, which in the case of fainting naturally becomes weakened. This is the reason why Homer and the early Greeks called a syncope ὀλιγηπελία or κακηπελία or (Ion.) νηπελία, that is, a state of weakness or absence of strength.⁷⁴

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

⁷³ "Die Sprache Homers als Ausdruck seiner Gedankenwelt," *Neue Jahrbücher*, 1939, pp. 399 ff.

⁷⁴ Derived from *ἀπελος, "strength, power," in Ion. εἰπελής, "strong, vigorous"; νηπελία, "weakness"; ON *af*, AS *afol*, "strength" (cf. Boisacq, *op. cit.*, p. 697; Walde and Pokorny, *op. cit.*, I, 176). An analogous term is ὀλιγοδρανέω: δράω, "make, do"; δράνω: ἔργον, πράξις . . . δύναμις Hesych.; ἀδρανής, "idle, inefficient, weak" (Bechtel, *Lexilogus*, p. 104; Walde and Pokorny, *op. cit.*, I, 803).

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

NOTE ON *EUMENIDES* 881-91

These lines of Athena constitute the turning-point in the scene. Previously, the Erinyes have given no sign of listening to the words of the goddess. In a fury of disappointment and frantic for revenge, they have uttered cries of despair and of rage whenever she paused, but on each occasion their cries did not bear any close relation to what she had been saying. Here, however, something important occurs. Athena makes no new offer, yet the Erinyes suddenly become willing to listen. What causes the change at this point?

No answer to this question is given in the very full commentary of the Headlam-Thomson edition of the *Oresteia*. It is ignored also by Wecklein, Paley, and Sidgwick. Verrall, in his translation of the *Eumenides*, indicates a pause after line 887 and inserts the statement that Athena's "voice ceases to be heard, and for a while she seems to commune with them in silence. They become suddenly calm, and show in their behaviour a great awe." In his Introduction¹ Verrall says of the Erinyes:

They are not bought. The poet, whose high and spiritual thoughts of the divine would with difficulty find a use for the chasm and tripod of Delphi, would not easily have imagined that a cave, or altars, or processions, or any local and limited function, however august, could purchase an alliance between Punishment and Pardon. The honors of Athena are soon accepted,—when the Erinyes entertain the offer: but the miracle is that they should entertain it; and this miracle is wrought by no bribe, but by the blessing of Zeus upon the mysterious persuasion of Athena.

But has Aeschylus left the miracle entirely unexplained, and did he depend on stage action alone to make his meaning clear to the audience? It is possible, I believe, to find definite indications in the text of reasons why the conversion of the Erinyes should appropriately begin at this point.

Three times before these lines are spoken,

Athena has made her proposal, each time in different words and with different emphasis. The Furies, on the other hand, with little thought and much violence, have emphasized their stand more crudely by reiteration. The opening words of the goddess, in each case, are significant. From the beginning, she aims to persuade them: *ἐμοὶ πίθεσθε μὴ βαρυστόνως φέρειν* (l. 794). She would have them understand that they are mistaken in claiming that they have been robbed of honor (ll. 780, 789, 792, 810, 819, 822), and her second speech begins: *οὐκ ἔστ' ἄτιμοι* (l. 823). When their cries become wilder than before, Athena starts the third, and longest, speech, in which she makes her offer by saying that she will bear with their anger: *ὀργὰς ξυνοίσω σοι· γεραίτερα γὰρ εἰ* (l. 848). But the Furies repeat their last outburst (ll. 870-88 = ll. 837-47).

So far, Athena has failed even to make them listen. As the first words of a reply stand the best chance of catching the attention of an angry opponent, it is important to notice why the openings chosen by the goddess did not accomplish this. Her indication at the outset that she will resort to persuasion, not force, means nothing to the Erinyes, though it has a deep significance for her, as is shown by her later references to it: (1) in her next speech (l. 829), (2) at the turning-point (ll. 885-87), and (3) after her success (ll. 970-75). Her second opening, "You are not without honor," they disregard because they hold the opposite belief. To her third opening, "I will bear with your anger," they are indifferent. But her fourth opening evidently does arrest their attention.

The speech that is to mark the turning-point begins: *οὗτοι καμοῦμαι σοι λέγουσα τὰγαθὰ* (l. 881). These are not striking words, and the reader may at first think the line colorless compared with Athena's last utterance:

*εὐ δῶσαν, εὐ πάσχουσαν, εὐ τιμωμένην
χώρας μετασχεῖν τῆσδε θεοφιλεστάτης*
[ll. 868-69].

¹ P. xxviii.

Indeed, this fourth speech is simpler in language than those that have preceded and calmer in tone. But this gives it even greater force. The Erinyes have repeatedly hurled their curses and threats against Athena and her city. Serenely she answers: "I shall not grow weary of telling you what is good." Their violence has had absolutely no effect upon her; and now, by stating calmly that it never will, she makes it useless. The Erinyes realize, suddenly and overwhelmingly, that they are confronted by something they have never known—something eternal and concerned with everlasting good.

The different experience that they had had with Apollo would naturally intensify their surprise at Athena's attitude. With expressions of scorn and loathing, he drove them from his temple (ll. 179-97), whereas Athena, equally surprised to find them in her domain, was determined to learn the truth and administer justice (ll. 406-34). Apollo tried to make them realize the sanctity of the marriage bond, but they replied with no opposing argument, no word to indicate that they had listened. They merely reiterated their determination to pursue their victim; whereupon Apollo, out of patience, answered: "Pursue him then, and make yourselves more trouble" (ll. 213-26).

Athena does not lose patience. What she proposes is entirely good—for the Erinyes as well as for the Athenians. She will continue to make this plain—calmly, clearly, and reasonably—until even they shall be convinced. Only by unrelenting effort, by unfailing patience, and without compulsion can a moral victory be achieved. Having won their attention, she

tells them it is her desire that they remain in her city, but she leaves them free to make their own choice. And now she appeals to what is best in the character of the Erinyes, to the thing that has made her wish to keep them in Athens—their genuine concern for justice.² If they decide to refuse her offer, they may do so. But in that event they cannot with justice inflict any evil on the place where they might have stayed and been honored forever (ll. 885-91). So the goddess prevails at last. With a change from lyric measures to iambic trimeter, the Chorus asks: "Queen Athena, what abode do you say is mine? . . . What honor is established for me?" (ll. 892, 894). The goddess has already told them these things in the speeches to which they would not listen (ll. 805-7, 834-36, 854-57), but she does not remind them of this fact in her answers.

The dramatic purpose of her earlier speeches seems, then, to be twofold—to fix certain important ideas in the minds of the spectators³ and to put before their eyes a concrete example of victory by persuasion, showing how reconciliation may bring about a union mightier than any triumph:

νικᾷ δ' ἀγαθὼν

ἔστις ἡμετέρα διὰ παντός [ll. 974-75].

PEARL CLEVELAND WILSON

HUNTER COLLEGE

² This has been powerfully expressed in ll. 490-565.

³ Such as the prevailing influence of Zeus (ll. 797, 826, 850), the devastation that might be wrought by the angry Erinyes (ll. 800-803, 830-32, 858-63), the fact that Athena could have used force but chose to rely on persuasion (ll. 794, 804-7, 826-29, 867-69), and a prophecy of the future glory of Athens (ll. 851-57).

JUVENAL 7. 126-28

atque ipse feroci
bellatore sedens curvatum hastile minatur
eminus et status meditatur proelia lusca.

The words are simple, and there is no syntax involved other than the most rudimentary, but the meaning of the passage has proved elusive, as an examination of the commentaries discloses. It is possible that in the interpretation not enough attention has been paid to

eminus. The phrase *minatur eminus* must mean, one would suppose: "librat minaciter ut eminus mittat." What would be the technique of such a *librator*? Two points seem essential, as one may gather from watching the javelin throwers in modern athletic contests: (1) the

head of the weapon must be well elevated to secure a proper trajectory; (2) the shaft must be grasped well back from the head.

Now if the artist who planned the statue of Aemilius followed military technique in his representation, he would encounter a difficulty which he may or may not have realized: the head of the spear would be heavy, if we have regard to Roman usage; the shaft relatively light. If these details were observed in the statue and no adequate support (extraneous to the realities of the case, to be sure) were provided for the *hastile*, in course of time the shaft would bend into a curve under the weight of the massive head—hence *curvatum hastile*. Thus the detail of the spear's poise, originally designed as a fine piece of realism, has become actually derisive.

In line with this idea is the view that *lusca* does not refer to an original detail of the statue, namely, the soldier closing one eye to secure a more accurate aim with the other, but represents another feature in which the statue has suffered deterioration. The scholium on *statua lusca* reads: "cuius oculus introrsus cedit"; and, while a scholium is not necessarily or always right, the explanation offered by this particular one is much more plausible than the notion that the whole statue is realism carried almost to the point of caricature, with Aemilius

squinting one-eyed along the line of fire. The eyeball of colored stone or glass has dropped down inside the statue, which thus becomes *lusca*. So *lusca* at one end of the description of the spear-feature of the statue parallels *curvatum* at the other: the mighty soldier is a *luscus*, and his spear exhibits a ludicrous curvature. Aemilius collects higher lawyer's fees because he has a military statue in his honor; but just look at the statue and its sorry state of disrepair! What a ridiculous thing on which to base a claim!

Translate: "and Aemilius himself, astride a fiery charger, poises truculently for long-range throw a shaft—bent into a curve! and rehearses battles as a statue—short one eye!"¹

WILLIAM HARDY ALEXANDER

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY

¹ In connection with the above exegesis I have consulted the editions of Friedlaender, Heinrich, Jahn, Weidner, Mayor, Lewis, Maclean, Pearson and Strong, Hardy, H. P. Wright, H. L. Wilson, J. D. Duff, Labriolle, and Villeneuve. I consider that my obligation is greatest to the edition of H. P. Wright ("Glenn's College Series" (Boston, 1901)), who was sufficiently troubled about *curvatum* and *eminus* to comment intelligently on their possibilities; but I believe I have clarified the views he advanced summarily. The whole treatment of the passage, from a total ignoring of the real difficulties to very peculiar speculations upon it, is in itself an interesting footnote on editorship.

EMENDATION OF PINDAR OLYMPIAN 9. 82 (76)

In his review in this *Journal* (XLI [1946], 172) of Turyn's new text of Pindar, Gilbert Norwood rejects all proposed emendations of γῶνος, which is unmetrical, and lays down conditions for successful emendation: "Any trochaic word that means 'son,' begins with a consonant, and needs a gloss may be admitted." I have proposed πῶλος to Professor Norwood. He agrees that this word satisfies his conditions and adds that it also satisfies another condition which he did not mention, namely, that imposed by the *ductus litterarum*, for the manuscript reading ΓΟΝΟC might easily be a corruption of ΠΛΑΟC. Hence we need not assume that corruption is due to the intrusion of a gloss, which, to be sure,

seems rather unlikely in this case. For πῶλος meaning "son" see Aeschylus *Choephoroe* 794, Euripides *Phoenissae* 947, and *Rhesus* 386. Consider also the use of -πῶλος in modern Greek patronymics. This use derives from πῶλος, "son," according to *A Handbook of Modern Greek*, by Edgar Vincent and T. G. Dickson (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1881), page 34. The modern development, while it would not be enough in itself to recommend the emendation, makes it reasonable to suppose that πῶλος, "son," may have been commoner in nonliterary use than it is in extant classical authors.

L. A. POST

Haverford College

BOOK REVIEWS

Sophocles en het grieksche pessimisme. By JOHANNES CORNELIS OPSTELTEN. Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff's Uitgeversmaatschappij N.V., 1945. Pp. xvi+226.

This Leiden dissertation, in which the author expresses himself as indebted principally to the guidance of the late Professor Vürtheim, was begun before the war, but its completion and publication became possible only with the restoration of freedom in the Netherlands. It includes, besides the main text, a short appendix on the envy of the gods, a subject index (but not an *index locorum*), and a very brief summary in English.

Every one of the seven tragedies of Sophocles presents a picture of human misery. The greater number close in disaster, and even in those which do not do so the persons involved pass through heavy pain and humiliation before an ending is gained which can in a sense be called "happy." Furthermore, the persons of the plays often give expression, out of their distress, to judgments implying the fundamental futility and unhappiness of human life. We learn, however, from the scanty traditions concerning Sophocles' life and personality that he was of a cheerful and equable temperament and lived in wholesome and genial relations with his fellow-Athenians. How is this seeming incongruity to be explained? What was his own view of the proportion between good and bad in human fortunes? If he found the bad to outweigh the good, how did he justify such an order, and where did he gather the courage to live and work in such a world? Some modern scholars have curtly tagged him with the label of "pessimist"; others, paradoxically, have termed him an "optimist." Which judgment is right? And, if his attitude is prevailingly pessimistic, what is the nature of his pessimism? Is it peculiar to himself, or does it belong to the general Greek view of life? What compensations does he find, to make life livable at all?

Such are the questions which the author of

this essay must have asked himself. He does not propound them thus bluntly, but he would probably acknowledge that they, or something like them, lay in his mind when he began his work. He says, indeed, that his study has been devoted to the problem of discovering some harmony in the life of the man and the life of the poet.

It is just to call this dissertation an essay, because it has the qualities of both literary forms. As a dissertation it shows the work of the patient investigator who reckons with all the available evidence and neglects none of the contributions of modern scholarship. On this side the work is thoroughly well done. But we must admit that the contribution to the sum of human knowledge is slight, in the ordinary sense of this grand phrase, which demands of the dissertation some concrete and definable novelty, whether the novelty have any value or no. One feels that the author, as a critic, was somewhat handicapped by the rules for writing a dissertation. He was bound to show explicitly that he was acquainted with all previous work pertinent to his subject, and the schematic form of a dissertation has led to much repetition. These things have made the book unduly long. But, in spite of these disadvantages, the book is still an essay in criticism, in which the author has given eloquent expression to observations and judgments which rest upon intimate and sympathetic knowledge of the poet, upon wide reading, and upon mature reflection.

"This book," he says at the beginning, "is to be, in the first place, a book about Sophocles. Its purpose is to come closer to him, if it be possible. The second part of the title indicates our point of departure and the way which we shall follow. Pessimism is our guide." In the end one finds this to be an accurate statement of what the author has done. It means that many aspects of Sophocles' work are disregarded, except for cursory remarks on matters which are germane to the principal subject.

But the word "pessimism" is allowed a wide range, so that, on the side of what may be called Sophocles' "philosophy of life," whether conscious or unconscious, it is fairly comprehensive. He says:

The pessimism which interests us is a pessimism with regard to human life as a whole and all that must be regarded as inherent in it. Whether we have to do with a pessimism of feeling or a pessimism of critical insight, with a pessimism of experience or a pessimism which is primarily directed to the future, with a moral pessimism or a religious pessimism, . . . this at any rate we can say: the pessimist, in all cases, more or less consciously marks with a minus-sign the product of his emotional and intellectual life from the point of view of our human lot, while the optimist marks the product with a plus-sign.

The way is cleared by an introductory chapter in which the author demonstrates that what he calls "Orphic pessimism" is not found in Sophocles. To do this he examines the texts in which previous writers have found allusion to what is generally known as the "Orphic" religion and discovers only the barest trace of it. This reviewer is not willing to concede that there was so definite a body of Orphic doctrine and practice as this implies; but it is certainly true that Sophocles pays no attention to the notion that the soul suffers imprisonment in the body as a punishment for sin and that it must look beyond death for its true happiness.

Proceeding, now, directly to his subject, the author studies first the general attitude of pessimism exhibited in the plays, examining it in relation to the circumstances of the times in which Sophocles lived and in comparison with Aeschylus. He says:

It is characteristic of the attitude of the three tragic poets that the question *pessimist?* presents itself as a problem only in the poet who represents the high point of the classical period, Sophocles; for it is just as clear that the pre-classical Aeschylus is not a pessimist, as that the late-classical, in some aspects even post-classical, Euripides is a pessimist.

In Aeschylus, guilt is the central fact. Men suffer for their sins. Moreover, whole families are subject to the penalties imposed for the sins of single members. But, withal, the poet seeks and discerns a cause and justification for

suffering. Sophocles, on the other hand, is primarily concerned with suffering itself, not with its cause. Suffering comes upon the innocent and the guilty alike, and he was not interested in constructing a theodicy. He concentrates his attention upon the personality of the hero. Emphasizing the nothingness of man in relation to the power of the gods and the vain delusions of which man is the victim, he depicts his hero as one possessed of greatness of soul, who, with a strong and passionate inner activity, struggles—and struggles successfully—to preserve his *arete*. In this triumphant conflict is found compensation for the stark misery with which the hero is oppressed. Sophocles' problem was an artistic one, not a moral or a religious one: not to justify the ways of God to man but to present in dramatic form the conduct and behavior of the hero under suffering. Suffering is a fact, the gods are a fact. These facts are accepted with resignation. But who knows what a lonely soul will do in the face of the incontrovertible facts of life? Only the artist; and if the lonely soul is a great soul, the artist can make of its fortunes a noble drama. It is the greatness of the heroic personality that makes tragedy and serves as a corrective to the sickly mood of pessimism.

The thoughts thus inadequately summarized are nowhere formulated by the author in just this way but are gathered from the book as a whole. They form, indeed, one of the most impressive themes of the book, which may be set over against the detailed account which he gives of the many facets of Sophoclean pessimism.

Next, consideration is given to the question whether Sophocles' choice of subjects for his plays and the alterations which he has made in the legends betray a tendency to pessimism. To the first half of the question the answer is definitely "No." As to the second, the conclusion is that the alterations (which are, after all, not numerous) are mostly made for reasons of technical dramaturgy and can be attributed to a pessimistic mood in only a few places.

The author now turns to a study of the particular passages in the plays which give expression to pessimistic sentiments. Of these he has collected something like seventy-five. He does

not discuss them individually or, except for one or two, suggest any doubt about their interpretation. But he classifies them under nine rubrics, such as "the worse prevails, the better fails," "the suffering of the innocent," "the transitoriness, instability, and uncertainty of human life." Then he analyzes the texts, in order to determine how far they are to be recognized merely as dramatically appropriate in their several places, how far they reveal Sophocles' own opinions, and to what degree these opinions may have been altered in the course of his lifetime. The general answer is that there is a tone of bitterness throughout the dramas, except in *Oedipus Tyrannus* and *Electra*, and that this tone must be imputed to the poet himself.

Next the author undertakes a comparison between the pessimism of Sophocles and that of his literary predecessors, and he brings forward many texts from the poets and from Herodotus and Heraclitus. The result of his study may be given in his own words: "Among the pessimistic themes there is none that had not been mentioned in Greek literature before our poet touched upon it. . . . Inversely, the only pessimism that did occur in pre-Sophoclean literature and not in Sophocles is the pessimism of the Orphics."

The last quarter of the book resembles the latter part of a sonata movement, in which the musical themes previously announced are worked out in many variations. The author reviews the several elements in his pattern of pessimism as they are exhibited in Sophocles and his predecessors, with a view to determining the general character of Greek pessimism and the personal pessimism of Sophocles in particular. Simple statements of the poets concerning the obvious facts of life are translated into pompous expressions involving such terms as "eudaemonism" and "hedonism" and other generalizing abstractions. Oversubtle analysis and fine-drawn distinctions result in confusion rather than in illumination. The effort to describe the psychology of Sophocles as a man is labored and unconvincing and involves a paradoxical reconciliation of opposites. The author's conclusion is that he cannot be called simply a pessimist or an optimist: he is a

pessimist in thought and insight, an optimist by nature. The element of optimism is discovered, by somewhat fanciful speculation, in certain compensations for undoubted pessimism—in a resigned acceptance of life as it is, in a deep belief and trust in God, and in the activity of artistic creation.

But, in the end, after reading the book through, one may gratefully acknowledge that the author has accomplished the purpose announced in his opening words. He does "come closer to Sophocles," and he carries the reader with him. By his sane, sensitive, and sympathetic criticism he has won for himself and the reader a fuller understanding and appreciation of the poet. Lovers of Sophocles can read the book with profit and without fear of having their sensibilities wounded by arbitrary rough-handling of the delicacy of Sophoclean art. The author himself, as he says with characteristic modesty, feels that here and there he has some vision of the truth about Sophocles, and he closes with words that show his keen perceptiveness and his distrust of dogmatic assertion: "Perhaps, in the end, we come closest to this truth when, leaving all analysis and synthesis behind, we turn to the works of the poet and give ourselves wholly to contemplation and enjoyment of his art."

IVAN M. LINFORTH

University of California

Phyllobolia für Peter von der Mühl zum 60. Geburtstag. By OLOF GIGON, KARL MEULI, WILLY THEILER, FRITZ WEHRLLI, and BERNHARD WYSS. Basel: Benno Schwabe & Co. Verlag, 1946. Pp. 288.

It is a rare delight to handle and to read—after these dismal war years—an anniversary volume printed on paper pleasing to touch, in clear and handsome type, and composed in a German wholly free from political and "racist" propaganda; but then, as the title-page reminds us, it was published in Basle by a group of five Swiss scholars, in honor of a sixth, whose own work, *Der grosse Aias*, the *Rektoratsprogramm* of Basel University (1930), may be familiar to some of my readers.

Five essays are offered: "Der erhabene und

der schlichte Stil in der poetisch-rhetorischen Theorie der Antike" (F. Wehrli); "Tacitus und die antike Schicksalslehre" (W. Theiler); "Studien zu Platons Protagoras" (O. Gigon); "Zu Gregor von Nazianz" (B. Wyss); and "Griechische Opferbräuche" (K. Meuli). Since out of these five there are two representing subjects in which the reviewer is, perhaps, least incompetent—to wit, the second and the fifth—an analysis, with critical annotations, of these may possibly be of some profit.

Among the many debatable assertions of O. Spengler, the statement that Greco-Roman civilization was unconscious of its own finiteness, lacking, as it were, a philosophy of history, was promptly challenged by Eduard Meyer,¹ who pointed out that the very opposite is true, citing Tacitus as an example. The text analyzed by Theiler (*Ann.* vi. 22) and parallels from Josephus and other historians of the imperial period clearly show that the problem of whether the life of the individual is governed by fate, which the Stoics (like the eighteenth-century deists) virtually identified with the *heimarmene*, or by blind chance (the doctrine of Epicurus), had been applied, in Hellenistic times, to the course of history, the rise and fall of empires. It might perhaps have been added that the earliest application goes back to Thucydides (i. 140), who has Pericles say: "It is possible that events, like human thoughts, follow an irrational course; that is why we impute to Fortune [τὴν τύχην] that which runs counter to our calculations."

The problem is, of course, intimately connected with another involving the age-old debate of free will versus fate. Following von Arnim (*Stoic. vet. fr.*, II, 964), Theiler ascribes to Chrysippus the only possible solution, namely, that the individual act of volition, though free when viewed subjectively, is none the less predetermined. The story of Tiberius and Thrasyllus, referred to on page 36 and taken to be historical—in reality it is merely a variant of the story of Alexander and Nectanebus²—is an exemplification of that solution. It is, however, questionable whether Chrysippus hit upon it independently. The

Talmud is familiar with it and, to drive home the lesson, quotes an *exemplum* borrowed from the Prakrit.³ Since Chrysippus was himself a Cilician, it is, on the whole, likely that, like so many other tenets of Stoicism, this (quite successful) attempt at harmonizing free will and fate is also really an achievement of oriental thought. Equally interesting is the fact that the same doctrine of predetermination entered the teaching of the church: it was defended with zeal and skill by the Dominicans, though fiercely attacked by the Jesuits.⁴ We meet with it again toward the end of the last century in Felix Dahn,⁵ who probably drew on Schopenhauer.

Epicurus was not slow in pointing out that an acceptance of the Stoic *heimarmene* precludes crime and punishment (p. 55). Indeed, as Theiler correctly observes, the objection is as old as Homer and Aeschylus, who frankly place the blame on the godhead; thus Goethe was to express it almost two millenniums and a half later:

Ihr führt ins Leben uns hinein,
Ihr lasst den Armen schuldig werden,
Dann überlasst ihr ihn der Pein;
Denn alle Schuld rächt sich auf Erden.

Against this doctrine Plato, in his *Republic*, renewed the old dictum of Heraclitus of Miletus: ἦθος ἀνθρώπων δαίμων, or, as Schiller was to express it: "In deiner Brust sind deines Schicksals Sterne." It is, however, difficult to see how this finding, though in itself true enough, can weaken Epicurus' position, since the ἦθος, too, is subject to the *heimarmene*.

In conclusion, Tacitus is shown to follow in the main the Stoic doctrine; but the sentence "ac tamen electionem vitae nobis relinquunt quam ubi elegeris, certum imminetium ordinem" is traced (p. 67) to the lectures of the Platonist Gaius, whose adopted son and pupil,

¹ *Mitteilungen d. Schlesischen Gesellschaft f. Volkskunde*, XXXI (1930), 148–50.

² E. Renan, *Nouvelles études d'histoire religieuse* (1899), pp. 413 ff.

³ *Sämtliche Werke poetischen Inhalts*, XIII (1899), 324:

Auf Glück ist und Unglück die Welt nicht gerichtet:
Das haben nur törichte Herzen erdacht!
Es will sich ein ewiger Wille vollenden;
Dem dient der Gehorsam, dem dient auch der Trotz.

¹ *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1924, col. 1767.

² *AJP*, XLVIII (1927), 359–66.

Bakchios, was to become the tutor of Marcus Aurelius (p. 70). Gaios must then have been a contemporary of Tacitus.

The fifth essay, though devoted to an altogether different subject, shares with the second one significant feature: it, too, is a masterpiece of historical research in a field in which literary evidence is scanty. The fact that in the case of Hellenistic philosophy that evidence once existed but was subsequently destroyed, while Meuli's study deals with the preliterate period of Greece, does not spell a great difference in mode of approach, which must necessarily be largely inductive.

Meuli distinguishes three wholly different types of sacrifice: (1) offerings of food and drink, closely connected with the worship of the dead and the chthonian divinities; (2) holocausts, involving total destruction (usually by fire) of the offerings, likewise made to the dead; and (3) the Olympian form of sacrifice, in which the gods are given the bones and other inedible portions of the victim, while the rest is eaten by worshipers and priests. The obvious preposterousness of the proposition notwithstanding, the Olympian sacrifice has, time and again, been classed with the food offerings. This impossible hypothesis Meuli effectively destroys, proving that it is really a survival from the hunting stage, which had never wholly disappeared from the Balkans—Artemis is a typical divinity of that stage—and which has not wholly disappeared even today—witness the numerous quaint customs still practiced by huntsmen as they were millenniums ago. One of the most characteristic of these is the cutting-up of the quarry according to minutely prescribed rules, whose original purpose was to allow the game species to replenish themselves. Thus in many cases the bones of the animal must not be broken but must be buried in the ground or thrown into running water, the idea being that only thus can the game animal be resuscitated to be killed and eaten a second time. By a careful documentation it is shown that such customs were taken over into sacrificial ritual—and not only by the Greeks. Thus the Vojdaks would eat the horse sacrificed to the dead, who were given only the head and the feet of the victim. Horse skulls and horse

feet found in tombs prove that the same custom was known to the pagan Hungarians (p. 259). It becomes clear, then, that the share of the gods in the Olympian form of sacrifice was originally no gift at all but a restitution made to the quarry, lest the species should die out, which would have entailed death by starvation of the tribe.

This very imperfect summary must suffice, though it can give but a faint idea of this sound and judicious application of the anthropological method. I venture to offer only a few criticisms in questions of detail. Robertson Smith's totemic form of sacrifice seems rather too cursorily dismissed (p. 197). The destruction of a city by fire and the self-immolation of its garrison may indeed have grown out of the same ideas which underlie the holocaust (p. 206); the custom is, however, not Greek but oriental, as is sufficiently shown by instances not quoted by the author: the destruction of Saguntum (219 B.C.); of Thala (in the Jugurthine War, 108 B.C.); of Xanthos (Lycia), besieged by Cyrus (546 B.C.) and again by Brutus (46 B.C.); and of Jerusalem (A.D. 70). Much the same thing occurred in A.D. 1189, when the Jews, besieged in the castle of York by a Christian mob, chose the same end rather than surrender. It is difficult to separate these instances of mass destruction and mass suicide from the fiery death of King Zimri at Tirzah (I Kings 16:18) and of Sin-šar-Iškum (the legendary Sardanapallus) at the fall of Nineveh (606 B.C.), the death on the pyre of the Carthaginian general Hamilcar after the lost battle of Himera (Herod. vii. 167. 1), the projected suicide of Croesus of Lydia, etc.—all imitations of the ritual death of the Tyrian Heracles (Ba'al Melqart), of which I have spoken elsewhere.⁶ On the holocaust offered to the *πόρνια θηρῶν* (p. 209), cf. *American Journal of Archaeology*, XLVI (1942), 496 ff.; on the hero's portion (*νῶτα γερῶσσια*) (p. 223) cf. *Revue celtique*, XLVIII (1931), 145-48. The covering of the eyes of the dead quarry by the huntsman (p. 250) seems somehow connected with the

⁶ *Jour. Amer. Orient. Soc.*, LXV (1945), 144-54; cf. also E. Durkheim, *Le Suicide* (1912), pp. 118 f., who failed to discern the underlying traditional and religious motive.

veiling of the eyes or face of persons about to die (*caput obnubere*), a custom equally well known in modern Italy,⁷ among the Teutonic peoples,⁸ and also in the Sassanid Empire, where King Chosroes II, like Caesar in Plutarch, veils himself before receiving the death blow.⁹ On page 263, note 5, Meuli recalls that Artemis, Apollon, or Pan receives, *inter alia*, the hide of a slain lion, together with its head and paws, which are affixed to trees (Paul. Silent., *Anth. Pal.* vi. 57); but the same custom is clearly referred to in Euripides' *Bacchae*, where the women, maddened by Dionysos, mistake Pentheus for a lion, cut off his head, and propose to affix it to the palace wall. Meuli's conjecture (p. 272) that the ceremonial cutting-up of the quarry as laid down in OFr documents is ultimately of Scandinavian origin is strikingly confirmed by the fact that the version of the *Tristan* which devotes a whole chapter to the subject is the work of an Anglo-Norman, the poet Thomas.¹⁰

This detailed analysis of at least two of the essays which make up this excellent volume may not appear altogether inappropriate at a time which, like that of Tacitus, is filled with dark forebodings: a work like the present one is calculated to inspire with new hope the waning courage of humanists. Not the least noteworthy of its features is its provenance: indeed, it is not a gift that comes to us from one of the Great Powers, the self-appointed guardians of our civilization, but from that sturdy little mountain republic that has given to the world an Ulrich Zwingli, a J. J. Bachofen, a Ferdinand de Saussure, and a Jakob Burckhardt. May its truly free universities grow and prosper, to help kindle anew the flame of scholarship and sound learning amid the rubble piles of Europe!

ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE

Princeton, New Jersey

⁷ F. Lenormant, *La Grande-Grèce* (Paris, 1881-84), III, 370.

⁸ Karl von Amira, *Abhandlungen d. Münchener Akad. d. Wissensch., philos.-philol. u. hist. Kl.*, XXXI (1922), Abh. 3, 165 f.

⁹ Firdousi, *Le Livre des rois*, trans. J. Mohl (Paris, 1876-78), VII, 320.

¹⁰ Thomas, *Le Roman de Tristan*, ed. J. Bédier (Paris, 1902-5), I, 43 ff.

Gabriel Harvey's "Ciceronianus." With an Introduction and Notes by HAROLD S. WILSON and an English translation by CLARENCE A. FORBES. ("University of Nebraska Studies in the Humanities," No. 4.) Lincoln, Nebraska, 1945. Pp. vii+149.

The lecture entitled *Ciceronianus*, delivered by Harvey at Cambridge in 1576, when he was Praelector in Rhetoric, does not rank with the major essays of this kind written on the Continent during the Renaissance; yet it has its due place in the history—not yet completely worked out for England—of the kindred questions, Ciceronianism and the doctrine of imitation. Latin eloquence flourished in the time of Elizabeth, the literary training was in Latin, style was a primary object of study, and the exemplar of prose style was "Tullie, whom," says Ascham, a conservative of the period, "above all, I like and love the best."

The theme of Harvey's oration is his renunciation of the influence exerted upon him by those Italian writers who represented a formalistic and slavish imitation of Cicero. Whereas formerly Harvey, so narrow was his vision, had seen in Cicero only the externals of style and in the practice of imitation had indulged in the puerile habit of intruding Ciceronian tags at every opportunity, he had, through Sambuc's *Dialogues on Imitation*, learned of Peter Ramus' works and, by reading these, had become a convert to the principle of "free" imitation. Now Cicero's *thought* has become the main object of Harvey's study, and he sees that he must join philosophy to eloquence and aim at the general culture which Cicero himself held as his goal. Erasmus, Sturm, and Freig contributed to this fuller and truer concept of Ciceronianism. Now in analyzing Cicero, Harvey will no longer restrict himself to labeling figures of speech or make exclusive use of commonplace-books. As a Ramist, he is resolved that dialectic (its provinces invention and disposition) shall come to the aid of grammar and of rhetoric (limited now to *ornatus* in style, and delivery), and so insure that the art of thinking is united to the art of speaking. Ramus and Talon, says Harvey, have done most for Ciceronian exegesis, eclipsing the contributions of those interpreters who have re-

vived the study of the Greek rhetoricians, Aristotle and Hermogenes, or of those who follow the Latin rhetoricians, Cicero and Quintilian, or of those who, like Turnèbe, prescribe no special doctrine of rhetoric. "Cicero is to be imitated with utmost zeal above all the rest, but not exclusively, nor totally, nor always" (72. 5-6).¹

Thus Harvey is far removed from such extremists as Longueil, who was proud to read nothing but Cicero for five years. Yet, as in most of the Renaissance literature on imitation, even of the "revolt" against his worshippers, Cicero continues alone to hold the primacy among the models, alone to hold "the crown, diadem, sceptre, and throne of eloquence" (48. 31-34).

The oration has elegance, humor, and liveliness. To what degree is it "Ciceronian"? A more thorough study than is provided in Section VI of the Introduction would have been welcome.

The editors, themselves using a traditional method of criticism, place this type of lecture in the class of deliberate oratory (14). But the eulogy of Cicero which it contains and the praise and censure of other writers, as well as certain aspects of display in Harvey's own virtuosity, make the discourse as much epideictic as deliberative.

The text of *Ciceronianus* is here republished for the first time since its original issue. The editors make several obvious corrections of misprints found in the original edition but keep the spellings of words like *plærisque*, *in-fœlix*, *inditio*, and *coecus*. (In the translation *pronunciatum* and *rationcinatio* appear in the same sentence [67].) A few minor changes were made in the punctuation; likewise, no harm would have come from paragraphing the Latin text so as to conform to that of the translation.

The translation is smooth and readable and maintains a reasonable standard of accuracy, except in a few passages dealing with rhetorical terms. For example, *ἐργασία* (40. 6) receives the vague rendering "art." But epicheiremes are here under consideration, and the *ἐργασία* is their *elaboratio* through a comparison, example, contrast, or the like (see Hermogenes

De inv. 3 [Spengel, II, 212 ff.]). Again, *de status qualitate* (86. 24) does not mean "the state of circumstances." Either translate as "the type of issue," or, perhaps better, emend to *de statu qualitatis*, "the issue of quality" (*ποῦότης*). That such terms present real difficulties to a translator is illustrated by the figures *traductio* and *translatio* (86. 13). I would suggest "transplacement" rather than "transfer" for *traductio*; and, since "metaphor" is in the context excluded from representing *translatio* (Harvey is criticizing the employment of Greek terms), I should prefer "transference" to "translation"; the ambiguity in "translation" is obvious. At 54. 4 *traductio* is rendered merely as "figure of speech," without definite naming.

Further suggestions: For *optimis et ornatissimis latinis auctoribus* (50. 8), say: "the best and most illustrious stylists" rather than "the best and most beautiful Latin authors." Should not *voculis pedibus* (76. 18) be separated by a comma (see the *Erratum elenchus*) and translated "particles and metrical feet" instead of "word-feet"? *Ita me ames* (84. 2) does not mean "I swear it as you love me," but "as truly as I wish you to love me." And, finally, *Utinam non me Eloquentia desereret* (58. 23) must, as it stands, refer to present time—not "I hope that Eloquence will not forsake me," but "Would that Eloquence were not now forsaking me." (Harvey's mood is facetious.) One here naturally asks whether Cicero would have used *non*.

The notes are adequate and helpful. Yet, instead of merely being referred to an authority, a reader might wish to learn directly about the Scales of Critolaus (52. 13), Porcius Latro (56. 23), Absyrtus (92. 25), and the distinction between *thesis* and *hypothesis* (86. 24; the use of the definite article in the translation is odd). On Harvey's coinage of the word *politularum* (64. 8), reference might have been made to H. C. Hart's articles in *Notes and Queries* (9th ser., 1903), XI, 501-2 and XII, 161-62, 263-65, concerning Harvey's fondness for neologisms in English. 52. 6 deserved a note explaining that the English word "emphasis" is here used in its technical sense as "meaning conveyed by implication." And the note to 86. 4, *nec argumentorum cellulas, nec argumentationum thesauros*,

¹ Citations are given thus by page and line.

should have defined *argumentum* and *argumentatio*. Does Harvey here and generally use *argumentum* in its Ramist meaning—*quod ad aliquid arguendum affectum est: quales sunt singulae rationes solae et per se consideratae*?

We hope that the editors will next republish, and with equal success, the two lectures which comprise Harvey's *Rhetor*.

HARRY CAPLAN

Cornell University

Milton and the Renaissance Ovid. By DAVIS P. HARDING. ("University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature," Vol. XXX, No. 4.) Urbana, 1946. Pp. 105. \$1.50.

Dr. Harding's principal aim is to throw some new light "on Milton's debt to Ovid by examining the Renaissance editions which Milton himself might have used"; and, in order to make his task manageable, he confines his investigation "mainly to the Renaissance editions of the *Metamorphoses*." The first chapter, "The Christian Ovid," gives a sketch of the allegorical and Christianized interpretations of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, which had such English exponents as Golding and Sandys, and of the decline of that tradition before rationalistic and Puritan hostility. The second chapter, "Ovid at St. Paul's," emphasizes, with the aid of such witnesses as the schoolmasters Brinsley and Hoole, the great importance of the study and imitation of Ovid in the schools. Dr. Harding pauses to consider the date of Milton's entering St. Paul's School and, after scrutinizing curricular gradations and other data, proposes 1617 instead of the usual, though conjectural, 1620; this is not in itself improbable, though the evidence cannot in the nature of the case be conclusive. As for Ovid, Dr. Harding finds that the young Milton went beyond pedagogical requirements and that his mastery of the corpus, including the amatory poems, was largely the result of private devotion.

In his three following chapters the author takes up Milton's Latin verse, *Comus*, and *Paradise Lost*. In the earlier Latin poems Milton follows grammar-school methods, with his

own special skill, in adapting and combining Ovidian phrases and epithets, sometimes, perhaps, with a hint or overtone from Renaissance commentators. After 1629 he abandons Ovid's erotic verse but continues to draw upon the *Metamorphoses*. In discussing the action of *Comus*, Dr. Harding favors a probable debt to Ovid, and possibly to Sandys, rather than to Spenser. The chapter on *Paradise Lost* takes up the Creation, Paradise, the Flood, and some smaller items, such as the stories of Typhon and Phaëthon, which may have contributed to Milton's pictures of Satan and the sun.

Dr. Harding has obviously studied Ovid's Renaissance editors and commentators with minute care and alertness; and we may trust that such labor will not have to be gone through again, that he has found whatever there was to find. He has some interesting gleanings, but they are, not unnaturally, rather scanty. At times he goes beyond the limited area indicated in his title and Preface and concerns himself simply with Ovid and Milton, though such excursions do not amount to a full study of Milton's use of the *Metamorphoses*. Such a full study is highly desirable—and Dr. Harding promises one which will include all Ovid's works—but it is extremely difficult, as anyone knows who has delved into Renaissance mythology, to avoid the dangers of either an overwhelming multiplicity of sources or concentration upon a single one. In trying to disengage Ovid from Milton's heterogeneous materials, Dr. Harding may sometimes oversimplify. For instance, in *Comus* and in the enchanter himself, Ovid may be mixed with such other sources—to mention only recent studies—as the Italian works described by Miss G. L. Finney (*SP*, Vol. XXXVII [1940]) and Erycius Puteanus (R. H. Singleton, *PMLA*, Vol. LVIII [1943]); and the small item of haemony has been discussed by Messrs. E. S. Le Comte and T. P. Harrison (*PQ*, Vols. XXII and XXIII [1942-43]). And, for *Paradise Lost*, there are the complications opened up by Professor Starnes's article on Milton and Renaissance dictionaries (University of Texas, "Studies in English," 1943).

In general, Dr. Harding collects and analyzes a good deal of the Ovidian material re-

corded by Miltonic scholars and adds more or less significant details from his own study of Ovid and Renaissance commentators, so that he gives a consecutive and considerable, if not a complete, view of the nature and process of Milton's borrowing from Ovid. Since Milton was not only steeped in the ancient classics but, as recent studies have tended to show, was apparently aware—like other learned poets—of Renaissance sources, there is room for reassessment of his classical lore. Dr. Harding, in focusing on Renaissance editors of Ovid, has taken that line; but one may hope that in his broader study he will find it possible not only to treat Ovid more fully but to set Ovidian material in a larger perspective.

DOUGLAS BUSH

Harvard University

Thessalische Mythologie. By PAULA PHILIPPSON. Zurich: Rhein-Verlag, 1944. Pp. 195+3 pls.+1 map.

The author explains at the beginning that she does not propose to give a complete account of Thessalian mythology, but "durch die Betrachtung jener thessalischen Gottheiten und ihrer Mythen, in denen Griechentum erstmalig die Welt geschaut und geformt hat, zu dieser ursprünglichen, griechischen Weltanschauung durchzudringen." About 2000 B.C., in her opinion, the first speakers of an Indo-European language reached Thessaly from the northeast; and the myths and cults that existed in Thessaly in the early centuries thereafter are the subject of her investigation. The sources for the study of these myths are relatively late, but the early origin of the myths is considered to be proved by the elements of pre-Greek-Aegean religion in them. There is little direct evidence on pre-Greek religion in Thessaly; but it is assumed that neolithic Thessaly, at about 2000 B.C., belonged to a linguistic and cultural unity with southern Greece, the Cyclades, and Crete and hence that what is known of Minoan religion would generally hold true for Thessaly. This fundamental assumption is far from certain. The horse, which is prominent in many myths and decidedly not in Minoan religion, is reasonably regarded as a

contribution of the invaders; but the proof that these myths with horses are very early is scarcely beyond question.

A great quantity of mythological material is examined. The titles of the chapters give only a slight idea of its variety: (i) "Posidan, der Gatte der Erde"; (ii) "Zeus Posidan"; (iii) "Die Göttin von Pherai"; (iv) "Vergleich der Aufeinanderfolge der Kosmen in den Mythen und Kulturen der Landschaften und in der Theogonie des Hesiod"; (v) "Der Pelion und die göttliche Trias: Chiron, Peleus und Thetis"; (vi) "Der Kosmos des Okeanos." Her central conclusion, so to speak, is presented in a table (pp. 109-10). In the first period Gaia, or Pheraia Hekate, was predominant, and her consort was Posidan. As "Individuationen" of these deities, Kronos, Hermes, Hades, Zeus, Demeter, Artemis, and Hera came into existence. In the second period Zeus was predominant, with Pheraia Hekate and Demeter as his consorts; and in the third Hera is his companion, with the whole Olympian host. Among numerous incidental conclusions is this: The references to centaurs in the first two books of the *Iliad* indicate that those books should be dated about 750 B.C. (p. 146).

Throughout the book there is much erudition and ingenuity; geography receives careful attention, as might be expected from the author's surname; etymology has a considerable role, and several branches of archeology; and numerous ancient authors, besides those principally used, are quoted. There is an error, remarkable of its kind though unimportant for the subject, in the transcription of Thera inscriptions: φ 's become ϕ 's (p. 150). Hesychios' remark on the goddess Pheraia is misunderstood (p. 75): he means that some say that she is Hekate. A corrigenda slip contains only one entry, which changes "historisch-zeitlosen" into "historisch-zeitlichen"; from this the practiced reader could draw inferences about considerable parts of the book. In the reconstructed history of primitive Greek religion, which the author presents, there is certainly an element of conjecture, but there is much that is plausible; and surely the attempt to reveal the long-forgotten childhood of the Greek, in one of its most important aspects, must kin-

dle the imagination and receive the respect of every classicist.

F. P. JOHNSON

University of Chicago

Griechische Wortstudien. By REINHOLD STRÖMBERG. (Göteborgs Kgl. Vetenskaps- och Vitterhets-Samhälles Handlingar," Vite Följden, Ser. A, Vol. II, No. 2.) Göteborg, 1944. Pp. 119. Kr. 8.00.

Studien zur Etymologie und Bildung der griechischen Fischnamen. By REINHOLD STRÖMBERG. ("Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift," Vol. XLIX, No. 2.) Göteborg, 1943. Pp. 165. Kr. 10.00.

Strömberg has been intent upon the study of Greek names of plants and animals and the like for some ten years or more. In English, only Sir D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson has devoted more than a passing attention to these things. His glossary of Greek fish-names will be awaited with interest, as the complement to Strömberg, even as Strömberg is a complement to Thompson. The *Wortstudien* deals with names of animals, plants, parts of the body, and diseases.

More than one classical scholar, to my knowledge, has had what they call in Scotland a "melting" for botany; and, for all I know, there may be some *bornés* disciples of Izaak Walton among them—victims of an atony that is too deep for me. But whoever will attempt to elucidate Greek scientific terminology must be something of a scientist. The comparative method is of little help, since the scientific vocabulary of Greek is largely Greek and grew up with the development of natural history as part of Greek philosophy; a remainder, not obviously Greek, consists almost entirely of philological conundrums. When the resources of Greek and of the analytical method are exhausted, most light is shed by semantic comparisons from other languages (e.g., English, "lady bird," neither bird nor lady; "proud flesh") or by folklore, which is rich in words for the things that Strömberg discusses. He has wisely turned to these sources of enlightenment: Liddell and Scott and Boisacq seem mere Mother Hubbard's cupboards by com-

parison, some places in the empty shelves of which these two monographs will help to fill. The wives of American professors of Greek should serve the "Tiernamen" and "Fischnamen" to their husbands these meatless days (I write these lines in August, 1946), so that even our Hellenists, stumped by *πάπραξ* (Hdt.) or *μηλολόνη* (Aristoph.) need no longer go empty away; after all, some Oxford don is said to have tried bluebottles once.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

Morphologie historique du grec. By P. CHANTRAINE. Paris: Klincksieck, 1945. Pp. ix+442.

A clear, concise, and complete account of the morphology of Greek, in the tradition of the French school. The dialects, inscriptions as well as literary texts, are well represented and also Hellenistic texts, down to the New Testament; occasionally the modern Greek forms are cited. There are no novelties; if anything has actually been learned during the last twenty years, it finds no admission here. The facts are stated, but no explanations are offered. M. Chantraine may well be skeptical, shall we say, about the new explanations of 3 sg. *-ει* (§ 346) or of *μέγας, μεγάλου* (§ 109); but a word of explanation about the accent of *τιμῆς* (§ 38) would not come amiss to the young. It is not solely a matter of phonology, knowledge of which M. Chantraine takes for granted. And, even if it were, I am daily more convinced that the study of historical grammar gains life when and only when the fences between phonology and morphology and syntax are low, with plenty of gateways back and forth, and when the study of the language is kept linked intimately with the literature. A language is "one world," or at least one body; the anatomy necessary for research and investigation exhibits only a bleeding corpse or flat diagrams in the classroom, instead of the living body. If you must have anatomical charts, these are flawless—and lifeless.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

BOOKS RECEIVED

[Not all works submitted can be reviewed, but those that are sent to the editorial office for notice are regularly listed under "Books Received." Offprints from periodicals and parts of books will not be listed unless they are published (sold) separately. Books submitted are not returnable.]

- BIGNONE, ETTORRE. *Storia della letteratura latina*, Vol. I: *Originalità e formazione dello spirito romano; l'epica e il teatro dell'età repubblicana*. 2d ed., revised. Vol. II: *La Prosa romana sino all'età di Cesare; Lucilio, Lucrezio, Catullo*. Firenze: G. C. Sansoni, 1945-46. Pp. xii+599; 470. Vol. I, L. 650; Vol. II, no price given.
- BLOCH, RAYMOND. *Les Origines de Rome*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1946. Pp. 127.
- DE N BOER, W. *De Allegores in het werk van Clemens Alexandrinus*. ("Dissertationes inaugurales Batavae ad res antiquas pertinentes," Vol. I.) Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1940. Pp. 161+[2]. 3.15 guilders.
- VAN DEN BRUWAENE, MARTIN. *Etudes sur Cicéron*. Bruxelles: L'Edition universelle, S.A., 1946. Pp. 112. Fr. 50.
- CASEY, ROBERT PIERCE (ed.). *The "De incarnatione" of Athanasius*, Part 2: "The Short Recension." ("Studies and Documents," ed. KIRSOPP LAKE, SILVA LAKE, and CARSTEN HÖEG, Vol. XIV.) London: Christophers; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1946. Pp. lii+86. \$4.00.
- DUCKETT, ELEANOR SHIPLEY. *Anglo-Saxon Saints and Scholars*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1947. Pp. x+488. \$5.00.
- DUNKIN, PAUL SHANER. *Post-Aristophanic Comedy: Studies in the Social Outlook of Middle and New Comedy at Both Athens and Rome*. ("Illinois Studies in Language and Literature," Vol. XXXI, Nos. 3-4.) Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1946. Pp. 192. Paper, \$2.50; cloth, \$3.00.
- The Excavations at Dura-Europos Conducted by Yale University and the French Academy of Inscriptions and Letters: Preliminary Report of the Ninth Season of Work, 1935-1936*. Edited by M. I. ROSTOVITZ, A. R. BELLINGER, F. E. BROWN, and C. B. WELLES. Part II: *The Necropolis*, by N. P. TOLL. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1946. Pp. viii+150+65 pls. \$5.00.
- FRANKFORT, H., et al. *The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man: An Essay on Speculative Thought in the Ancient Near East*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946. Pp. viii+401. \$4.00.
- GALLAVOTTI, CAROLUS (ed.). *Theocritus quique feruntur bucolici Graeci*. ("Scriptores Graeci et Latini consilio Academiae Lynceorum editi.") Roma: Typis [Regiae] Officinae Polygraphicae (La Libreria dello Stato), 1946. Pp. lxx+331. L. 1000.
- GRANT, MICHAEL. *From Imperium to Auctoritas: A Historical Study of Aes Coinage in the Roman Empire, 49 B.C.-A.D. 14*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1946. Pp. xviii+510+[2]+12 pls.
- HEINIMANN, FELIX. *Nomos und Physis: Herkunft und Bedeutung einer Antithese im griechischen Denken des 5. Jahrhunderts*. ("Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft," ed. BERNHARD WYSS et al., Heft 1.) Basel: Verlag Friedrich Reinhardt AG, 1945. Pp. 221. Broschiert, Fr. 9.50.
- Hermathena*, No. LXVIII (November, 1946). Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co.; London: Longmans, Green & Co. 3s.
- HERRICK, MARVIN T. *The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism, 1531-1555*. ("Illinois Studies in Language and Literature," Vol. XXXII, No. 1.) Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1946. Pp. viii+117. Paper, \$1.50; cloth, \$2.00.
- HUTTON, JAMES. *The Greek Anthology in France and in the Latin Writers of the Netherlands to the Year 1800*. ("Cornell Studies in Classical Philology," Vol. XXVIII.) Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1946. Pp. xiv+822. \$5.00.
- Hyde, Walter Woodburn. *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege (Oxford University Press), 1946. Pp. viii+296. \$4.00.
- JONES, LESLIE WEBBER (trans.). *An Introduction to Divine and Human Readings by Cassiodorus Senator*. Translated with an Introduction and Notes. ("Records of Civilization—Sources and Studies," ed. AUSTIN P. EVANS, No. 40.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1946. Pp. xviii+233. \$3.00.
- JONES, W. H. S. *Philosophy and Medicine in Ancient Greece, with an Edition of Περὶ ἀρχαίων ἱγρικῆς*. (Bulletin of the History of Medicine, Suppl. 8.) Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1946. Pp. vi+100. \$2.00.
- KENT, ROLAND G. *The Forms of Latin: A De-*

- scriptive and Historical Morphology*. ("Special Publications of the Linguistic Society of America.") Baltimore: Waverly Press, Inc. (for the Linguistic Society of America), 1946. Pp. 159. \$4.00.
- METZGER, BRUCE M. *Lexical Aids for Students of New Testament Greek*. Princeton, N.J.: The author, 1946. Pp. x+110. \$1.00. Order from the author, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N.J.
- PERCY, ERNST. *Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe*. ("Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund," Vol. XXXIX.) Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1946. Pp. xviii+517.
- VON SALIS, ARNOLD. *Antike und Renaissance: Über Nachleben und Weiterwirken der alten in der neueren Kunst*. Erlenbach-Zürich: Eugen Rentsch Verlag, 1947. Pp. 280+64 pls.+30 figs. Paper, Fr. 20; cloth, Fr. 22. *Science and Society*, Vol. X, No. 4 (fall, 1946). \$0.40.
- SVENNUNG, J. *Compositiones Lucenses: Studien zum Inhalt, zur Textkritik und Sprache*. ("Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift," 1941, Fasc. 5.) Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln; Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1941. Pp. x+204. Kr. 6.
- Universidad de Antioquia*, Nos. 78-79 (June-August, 1946) and No. 80 (September-November, 1946). Medellín, Colombia: Universidad de Antioquia.

MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE LATIN TRANSLATIONS AND COMMENTARIES

Announcement is hereby made of a new co-operative research project to prepare annotated lists and guides for (1) medieval and Renaissance Latin translations from ancient Greek and (2) medieval and Renaissance Latin commentaries on ancient Greek and Latin authors.

The list of translations will survey Latin translations, produced from antiquity down to A.D. 1600, of Greek authors who wrote before A.D. 600. It will contain such information as the names of translators with short biographical data; date, place, and circumstances under which individual translations were made; *incipits* and *explicits*; references to manuscripts and printed editions containing the translations; and recent scholarly literature on individual translators. This list will therefore provide a guide to the literary and documentary evidence available for an evaluation of the survival, rediscovery, and reception in the Latin West of ancient Greek writings from antiquity through the Middle Ages and the Renaissance to A.D. 1600.

The list of commentaries will include information similar to that for translations regarding Latin commentaries, made from ancient times through A.D. 1600, on authors of Greek and Latin antiquity who wrote before A.D. 600. It will, however, for the present at

least, exclude commentaries on Aristotle; on medical, legal, and canonistic works; on the Bible; and on medieval Latin authors. The listing of commentaries, which represent a common but comparatively neglected branch of literature, will supplement information contained in catalogues of old libraries and should provide tangible proof for an appraisal of the use or lack of use made of ancient authors through the centuries before A.D. 1600.

The project has been approved by the Committee on Renaissance Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies; by the American Philological Association; and by the Mediaeval Academy of America.

The following scholars are members of the editorial board: R. J. Clements (Harvard), M. E. Cosenza (Brooklyn College), J. Hutton (Cornell University), P. Kibre (Hunter College), P. O. Kristeller (Columbia), D. P. Lockwood (Haverford), M. R. P. McGuire (Catholic University of America), B. Marti (Bryn Mawr), R. V. Merrill (University of California, Los Angeles), E. M. Sanford (Sweet Briar), J. J. Savage (Fordham), J. R. Strayer (Princeton), A. Taylor (University of California, Berkeley), S. H. Thomson (University of Colorado), B. L. Ullman (University of North Carolina).

Inquiries regarding the project may be directed to any editor in the above list.

ten
ch:
-64

(6).

ien
he.
41,
ska
tz,

ne-
er-
ni-

on
he
st-
on
ra-
in
de
or
gh

n-
ri-
ri-
he

he
(1),
on
ol-
k-
o-
rn
a,
J.
(1),
(1),
L.

oe